

CHARACTER SHEAVES ON UNIPOTENT GROUPS IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC: FOUNDATIONS

MITYA BOYARCHENKO AND VLADIMIR DRINFELD

ABSTRACT. In this article we give a concise exposition, with complete proofs, of the most basic aspects of the theory of character sheaves on unipotent groups. We restrict attention to unipotent algebraic groups G over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 0$. We show that every admissible pair for G gives rise to an L -packet of character sheaves on G , and that, conversely, every L -packet of character sheaves on G arises from a (non-unique) admissible pair. This result allows us to prove a number of fundamental conjectures concerning character sheaves on unipotent groups, formulated by the second author in the spring of 2006. The relation of the theory of character sheaves to characters of unipotent groups over finite fields, as well as to the theory of modular tensor categories, is not discussed here, and will be the subject of future works.

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1. Main definitions and results	4
2. Idempotents in monoidal categories	15
3. Serre duality and Fourier-Deligne transform	24
4. Fourier decomposition in a geometric setting	27
5. Reduction process for equivariant complexes	33
6. Proofs of the main results	39
Appendix	45
References	50

Both authors were supported by the NSF grant DMS-0701106.

M.B. was also supported by the NSF Postdoctoral Research Fellowship DMS-0703679.

Address: Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.

E-mail: mitya@math.uchicago.edu (M.B.), drinfeld@math.uchicago.edu (V.D.).

INTRODUCTION

In a series of works beginning in the 1980s, George Lusztig developed a theory of character sheaves for reductive algebraic groups and explored its relation to the character theory of finite groups of Lie type. In 2003, he conjectured that there should also exist an interesting theory of character sheaves for unipotent groups in positive characteristic, and calculated the first example of a nontrivial L -packet in this setting [Lu03]. A general definition of an L -packet of character sheaves on a unipotent group over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 0$ was given in [BD06], where a list of conjectures related to this notion was also formulated.

A brief introduction to the theory of character sheaves on unipotent groups was given in a joint talk by the authors, the slides for which are available online [BD08]. The present article contains the proofs of the results announced in Parts I and II of that talk (Part III was devoted to the relationship between character sheaves and characters of unipotent groups over finite fields).

Let us summarize the main features of the theory to which our work is devoted. Precise statements of the main results, as well as all the background definitions, are contained in §1, which can be viewed as an “extended introduction” to the paper.

Let G be a unipotent algebraic group over k , and fix a prime $\ell \neq p = \text{char } k$. Let $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ denote the G -equivariant derived category of constructible $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -complexes on G , where G acts on itself by conjugation. It is a braided monoidal category with respect to the functor of convolution with compact supports (Def. 1.6), which we denote by $(M, N) \mapsto M * N$. Let us say that an object $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is a *closed idempotent* if there exists an arrow $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow e$ that becomes an isomorphism after convolving with e , where $\mathbb{1}$ is the unit object in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ (the delta-sheaf at the identity $1 \in G$). The notion of a *minimal closed idempotent* is defined in the obvious way. If $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is a minimal closed idempotent, the *L -packet of character sheaves corresponding to e* is defined as the collection of objects $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ such that $e * M \cong M$, and such that the underlying complex of M (obtained by discarding the G -equivariant structure) is an irreducible perverse sheaf on G .

Some of the fundamental properties of character sheaves, proved in this article, are as follows. Every L -packet of character sheaves on G is finite. If M and N are two character sheaves on G , then $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{D}_G(G)}^i(M, N) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Moreover, if M and N lie in the same L -packet defined by a minimal closed idempotent $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, then $M * N$ is perverse up to cohomological shift by an integer n_e determined only by e (if M and N lie in different L -packets, then $M * N = 0$).

One of the ingredients in the proof is an explicit construction of minimal closed idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, based on the notion of an *admissible pair* for a unipotent group (§1.7) and on the construction of the *induction functor with compact supports* $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ for a closed subgroup $G' \subset G$ (see §1.9).

These tools were used previously in [Bo07] to develop a geometric approach to the study of characters of unipotent groups over finite fields. In particular, it was proved there that every admissible pair for G gives rise to a minimal *weak* idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, where a weak idempotent is defined as an object $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ that satisfies $e * e \cong e$. In the present article we complete the picture by showing that the classes of minimal closed idempotents and minimal weak idempotents (which *a priori* could be very different) in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ coincide. In addition, we prove that *every* minimal (weak or closed) idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ arises from an admissible pair for G .

Several results that were established in [Bo07] play a role in this work as well. The main new ingredient is the geometrization of the Fourier decomposition of a complex representation of a finite abelian group, developed in §4. As the main tool, it uses the Fourier-Deligne transform, which was originally introduced by Pierre Deligne in [De76]. In addition, §2 is devoted to an exposition of the basic theory of closed idempotents in a general monoidal category, and contains some “abstract nonsense” that is used in the proofs of the main results of our work (by contrast, only the notion of a “weak idempotent,” which is uninteresting from the categorical viewpoint, was used in [Bo07], because character sheaves were not studied there).

1. MAIN DEFINITIONS AND RESULTS

Most of this section is devoted to recalling several definitions and constructions that were discussed at length in [BD06] and/or [Bo07]. We try to be as concise as possible, sometimes sacrificing the utmost generality for the sake of brevity. Notably, our treatment of Serre duality is rather *ad hoc*. For a canonical definition of the Serre dual of a connected unipotent group over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$, we refer the reader to the appendices on Serre duality in [BD06, Bo07].

In §§1.1–1.3 we recall some basic facts about derived categories of constructible ℓ -adic complexes, along with their equivariant versions. We also introduce the monoidal categories $\mathcal{D}(G)$ and $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ associated with any unipotent group G . The definition of character sheaves on unipotent groups in positive characteristic is given in §1.4. It is followed by a digression in §1.5, where we recall several well known results of character theory for finite groups that serve as a motivation behind our approach to the analysis of character sheaves. The main results of our work, along with various preliminaries, appear in §§1.7–1.11. Finally, in §1.12 we explain the organization of the remaining sections of the article.

1.1. Basic definitions and notation. Throughout this article we work over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 0$. We also fix, once and for all, a prime $\ell \neq p$ and an algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ of the field $\mathbb{Q}_\ell$ of ℓ -adic numbers.

By an *algebraic group* over k we will mean a smooth group scheme (equivalently, a reduced group scheme of finite type) over k . A *unipotent algebraic group* (or “unipotent group,” for brevity) over k is an algebraic group over k that is isomorphic to a closed subgroup of the group $UL_n(k)$ of unipotent upper-triangular matrices of size n over k , for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 1.1. Many of the definitions and results of our work can be formulated for unipotent groups over an arbitrary field k of positive characteristic (sometimes it is necessary to assume that k is perfect), and most of the auxiliary facts (see §§3–5) remain valid in this more general setting. On the other hand, their proofs can be trivially reduced to the case where k is algebraically closed. In addition, certain important properties of character sheaves require k to be algebraically closed. For these reasons, we find it more convenient to assume that k is algebraically closed from the very beginning of our investigation.

If X is an arbitrary scheme of finite type over k , one knows how to define the bounded derived category $D_c^b(X, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ of constructible complexes of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -sheaves on X (see, e.g., [De80, §§1.1.2–1.1.3]). We will denote it simply by $\mathcal{D}(X)$, since ℓ is fixed. It is a triangulated $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -linear category. Furthermore, it is equipped with a self-dual *perverse* t -structure $({}^p\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(X), {}^p\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(X))$ [BBD82], whose heart, $\text{Perv}(X) = {}^p\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(X) \cap {}^p\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(X)$, is called the category of *perverse sheaves* on X . It is an abelian category in which every object has finite length (*op. cit.*, Thm. 4.3.1(i)).

1.2. Formalism of the six functors. In what follows, we will frequently employ Grothendieck’s “formalism of the six functors” for the categories $\mathcal{D}(X)$ (as well as their equivariant versions, defined in §1.3 below); notably, the pullback functor $f^* : \mathcal{D}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(X)$ and the pushforward functor $f_* : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$, defined for an arbitrary morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ of k -schemes of finite type, as well as the functor of “pushforward with compact supports,” $f_! : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$, defined when f is separated (see, e.g., exposé IV in [SGA4 $\frac{1}{2}$]). *Hereafter, we omit the letters “L” and “R” from our notation for the six functors; thus, $f_!$ will stand for $Rf_!$ and $\otimes$ will stand for $\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}^L$, etc.*

1.3. Equivariant derived categories. We remain in the setup of §1.1. Let G be an algebraic group over k , let X be a scheme of finite type over k , and suppose that we are given a regular left action of G on X . In general, to get the correct definition of the “equivariant derived category” $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$, one must either adopt the approach of Bernstein and Lunts [BL94] (when G is affine), or use the definition of ℓ -adic derived categories for Artin stacks due to Laszlo and Olsson [LO06] and define $\mathcal{D}_G(X) = \mathcal{D}(G \backslash X)$, where $G \backslash X$ is the quotient stack of X by G .

From now on we assume that G is unipotent. In this case one knows that the naive definition of $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ (taken from [BD06]) already gives the correct answer.

Let us write $\alpha : G \times X \rightarrow X$ for the action morphism and $\pi : G \times X \rightarrow X$ for the projection. Let $\mu : G \times G \rightarrow G$ be the product in G . Let $\pi_{23} : G \times G \times X \rightarrow G \times X$ be the projection along the first factor G . The category $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ is defined as follows.

Definition 1.2. An *object* of the category $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ is a pair (M, ϕ) , where $M \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and $\phi : \alpha^* M \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi^* M$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(G \times X)$ such that

$$\pi_{23}^*(\phi) \circ (\text{id}_G \times \alpha)^*(\phi) = (\mu \times \text{id}_X)^*(\phi), \quad (1.1)$$

i.e., the composition of the natural isomorphisms

$$(\text{id}_G \times \alpha)^* \alpha^* M \cong (\mu \times \text{id}_X)^* \alpha^* M \xrightarrow{(\mu \times \text{id}_X)^*(\phi)} (\mu \times \text{id}_X)^* \pi^* M \cong \pi_{23}^* \pi^* M$$

equals the composition

$$(\text{id}_G \times \alpha)^* \alpha^* M \xrightarrow{(\text{id}_G \times \alpha)^*(\phi)} (\text{id}_G \times \alpha)^* \pi^* M \cong \pi_{23}^* \alpha^* M \xrightarrow{\pi_{23}^*(\phi)} \pi_{23}^* \pi^* M.$$

A *morphism* $(M, \phi) \rightarrow (N, \psi)$ in $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ is a morphism $\nu : M \rightarrow N$ in $\mathcal{D}(X)$ satisfying $\phi \circ \alpha^*(\nu) = \pi^*(\nu) \circ \psi$. The *composition* of morphisms in $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ is defined to be equal to their composition in $\mathcal{D}(X)$.

Remark 1.3. With the aid of the proper base change theorem and the smooth base change theorem, one can easily “upgrade” the functors f^* , f_* and $f_!$ mentioned in §1.2 to functors between the equivariant derived categories $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_G(Y)$, in the case where a unipotent group G acts on X and Y , and the morphism f commutes with the G -action (cf. [Bo07, §3.4]).

Remark 1.4. By construction, we have a faithful forgetful functor $\mathcal{D}_G(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(X)$. If G is a *connected* unipotent group over k , one can show that the forgetful functor is fully faithful (cf. [BD06]). In other words, being G -equivariant becomes a *property* of an ℓ -adic complex on X in this case.

Definition 1.5. If G is a unipotent algebraic group over k , the *equivariant derived category of G* is defined as the equivariant derived category $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ with respect to the conjugation action of G on itself.

Definition 1.6. Let G be a unipotent algebraic group over k . If M and N are objects of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ (respectively, $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$), the *convolution with compact supports* of M and N is the object of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ (respectively, $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$) defined by $M * N = \mu_!((p_1^* M) \otimes (p_2^* N))$, where $\mu : G \times G \longrightarrow G$ is the multiplication morphism and $p_1, p_2 : G \times G \longrightarrow G$ are the first and second projections.

Convention 1.7. From now on, the words “with compact supports” will be dropped, and the bifunctor $*$ will simply be referred to as the *convolution* of complexes on G . The reason is that the other convolution bifunctor, obtained by replacing $\mu_!$ with μ_* in Definition 1.6, will never appear in the present work.

Remark 1.8. It is easy to construct associativity constraints for the bifunctors $*$ on $\mathcal{D}(G)$ and on $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, making each category monoidal, with unit object $\mathbb{1}$ being the delta-sheaf at the identity element $1 \in G(k)$. In addition, $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ can be equipped with a natural braiding. We will not use the latter fact in the present article, so we will not prove it. However, sometimes we will need the following “weak central property” of the forgetful functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G)$.

Lemma 1.9. *For all $M \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ and $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, there are functorial isomorphisms*

$$\beta_{M,N} : M * N \xrightarrow{\sim} N * M.$$

For a proof, see, e.g., [Bo07, Lem. 3.5].

1.4. Character sheaves and L -packets. The notion of a character sheaf on a unipotent algebraic group G is defined in terms of certain “idempotents” in the category $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. A more exhaustive study of idempotents in monoidal categories (which does not depend on any of the other results of the present article) appears in §2. Here we will briefly summarize some of the definitions given in that section, specialized to the monoidal category $(\mathcal{D}_G(G), *, \mathbb{1})$.

Definitions 1.10 (Weak and closed idempotents; minimal idempotents; Hecke subcategories). In the setup of §1.1, let G be a unipotent algebraic group over k .

- (1) An object $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is said to be a *weak idempotent* if $e * e \cong e$. It is said to be a *closed*¹ *idempotent* if there exists a morphism $\mathbb{1} \longrightarrow e$ that becomes an isomorphism after convolving with e .

¹The origin of the adjective “closed” is explained in §2.2.

- (2) If $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is a weak idempotent, the *Hecke subcategory* associated to e is the full subcategory $e\mathcal{D}_G(G) \subset \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ consisting of objects $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ such that $e * M \cong M$ (equivalently, such that $M \cong e * N$ for some $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$).
- (3) An object $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is said to be a *minimal weak idempotent* (respectively, a *minimal closed idempotent*) if e is a weak (respectively, closed) idempotent, $e \neq 0$, and for every weak (respectively, closed) idempotent e' in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, we have either $e * e' = 0$, or $e * e' \cong e$.

Remark 1.11. The notion of a weak idempotent is not very useful from the viewpoint of category theory. For example, for every weak idempotent $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, the Hecke subcategory $e\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is closed under convolution (in view of Lemma 1.9), but we do not know whether e is always a unit object in $e\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ (equivalently, whether the functor $M \mapsto e * M$ is an autoequivalence of $e\mathcal{D}_G(G)$). On the other hand, for closed idempotents, the analogous statement does hold (see Proposition 2.11), and, generally, the notion of a closed idempotent is much more rigid than that of a weak idempotent. Nevertheless, the interplay between weak and closed idempotent, studied in §2, turns out to be useful for proving the main results of our work.

Definitions 1.12 (Character sheaves and L -packets). With the assumptions of §1.1, let G be a unipotent algebraic group over k .

- (1) Let $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ be a minimal closed idempotent. We write $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$ for the full subcategory of the Hecke subcategory $e\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ consisting of those objects for which the underlying ℓ -adic complex is a perverse sheaf on G . It is clear that $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$ is an additive $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -linear subcategory of $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. The *L -packet of character sheaves* on G defined by e is the set of (isomorphism classes of) indecomposable objects of the category $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$.
- (2) An object of $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is a *character sheaf* if it lies in the L -packet of character sheaves defined by some minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.

The first main result of this article is the following

Theorem 1.13. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , and let $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ be a minimal closed idempotent.*

- (a) *Then $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$ is a semisimple abelian category with finitely many simple objects. In particular, L -packets of character sheaves on G are finite.*
- (b) *There exists a (necessarily unique) integer n_e such that $e[-n_e] \in \mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$. The subcategory $\mathcal{M}_e = \mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}[n_e] \subset \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is closed under convolution, and is a monoidal category with unit object e .*

The proof is given in §6.6. It relies on a certain explicit construction of all minimal closed idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ (and the corresponding L -packets), which is the key-stone of our approach to the theory of character sheaves on unipotent groups. This construction, based on the notion of an admissible pair (§1.7) and on the induction functors for equivariant derived categories (§1.9), is explained in §1.10.

1.5. Elementary reminders. We now make a short digression to recall several constructions and results from character theory for finite groups that are, for the most part, very standard and well known. In the remainder of the article we will see that all of them admit suitable geometric analogues in the world of equivariant ℓ -adic complexes on unipotent groups, which are both interesting in their own right, and play an essential role in the proofs of our main results.

1. Let Γ be a finite group, let $\text{Fun}(\Gamma)$ denote the algebra of functions $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ under pointwise addition and convolution, and let $\text{Fun}(\Gamma)^\Gamma \subset \text{Fun}(\Gamma)$ denote the subalgebra of conjugation-invariant functions². Then there is a bijection between the set of complex irreducible characters of Γ and the set of minimal (or “indecomposable”) idempotents in $\text{Fun}(\Gamma)^\Gamma$, given by $\chi \mapsto \frac{\chi(1)}{|\Gamma|} \cdot \chi$.

This fact is one of the reasons why the definition of character sheaves involves minimal idempotents. Another motivation, coming from the orbit method for unipotent groups of “small” nilpotence class, is explained in detail in [BD06].

2. An important role in character theory of finite groups is played by the operation of induction of class functions. If $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ is a subgroup and $f \in \text{Fun}(\Gamma')^{\Gamma'}$, the induced function $\text{ind}_{\Gamma'}^\Gamma f \in \text{Fun}(\Gamma)^\Gamma$ can be obtained in two steps. First, we extend f by zero outside of Γ' to obtain a Γ' -invariant function $\bar{f} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Next, for every coset $\gamma\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$, we form the corresponding conjugate, $\bar{f}^\gamma$, of $\bar{f}$ (it depends only on the coset $\gamma\Gamma'$ and not on the particular element γ), and we define $\text{ind}_{\Gamma'}^\Gamma f$ as the sum of all these conjugates, indexed by the elements of Γ/Γ' .
3. If χ is a complex irreducible character of Γ' , there is a result, called *Mackey’s irreducibility criterion*, which gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the induced character $\text{ind}_{\Gamma'}^\Gamma \chi$ to be irreducible as well. It is not hard to show that this result can be reformulated as follows: with the notation of #2 above, $\text{ind}_{\Gamma'}^\Gamma \chi$ is irreducible if and only if $\bar{\chi} * \delta_x * \bar{\chi} = 0$ for every $x \in \Gamma \setminus \Gamma'$, where δ_x denotes the delta-function at x .
4. Some complex irreducible representations of a finite group Γ can be obtained by means of the following construction. Consider a pair (H, χ) consisting of a subgroup $H \subset \Gamma$ and a homomorphism $\chi : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$. Let Γ' be the stabilizer of the pair (H, χ) with respect to the conjugation action of Γ . We say that the pair (H, χ) is *admissible* if the following three conditions are satisfied:
 - (1) Γ'/H is commutative;
 - (2) the map $B_\chi : (\Gamma'/H) \times (\Gamma'/H) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ induced by $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \mapsto \chi(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_1^{-1} \gamma_2^{-1})$ (which, in view of (1), is well defined and biadditive) is a perfect pairing, i.e., induces an isomorphism $\Gamma'/H \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Hom}(\Gamma'/H, \mathbb{C}^\times)$; and
 - (3) for every $g \in \Gamma$, $g \notin \Gamma'$, we have $\chi|_{H \cap H^g} \neq \chi^g|_{H \cap H^g}$, where $H^g = g^{-1}Hg$ and $\chi^g : H^g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is obtained by transport of structure: $\chi^g(h) = \chi(ghg^{-1})$.

²It coincides with the center of $\text{Fun}(\Gamma)$. Its elements are often called “class functions” on Γ .

Now, properties (1) and (2) above imply that the group Γ' has a unique complex irreducible representation π_χ that acts on H by the homomorphism χ . Property (3) then implies that the induced representation $\text{Ind}_{\Gamma'}^\Gamma \pi_\chi$ is irreducible, in view of Mackey's irreducibility criterion (see #3).

5. Finally, if Γ is a finite *nilpotent* group, then *every* complex irreducible representation of Γ arises from an admissible pair by means of the construction explained in #4. This is proved in one of the appendices to [BD06].

1.6. Perfect schemes and groups. One of the main technical tools used in the present article is the *geometric* notion of an admissible pair for a *unipotent* group over k , introduced in §1.7. The definition of this notion uses Serre duality for unipotent groups. However, as explained in [BD06], the Serre dual of a (connected) unipotent group over k can only be defined canonically (i.e., by means of a universal property) as a group object in the category of *perfect* schemes over k . For this reason, it will be technically more convenient for us to place ourselves in the framework of perfect schemes and perfect group schemes from the very start.

Let us recall that a scheme S in characteristic p (i.e., such that p annihilates the structure sheaf $\mathcal{O}_S$ of S) is said to be *perfect* if the morphism $\mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_S$, given by $f \mapsto f^p$ on the local sections of $\mathcal{O}_S$, is an isomorphism of sheaves. In particular, a commutative ring A of characteristic p is perfect [Gr65] if and only if $\text{Spec } A$ is a perfect scheme. We will denote by $\mathbf{Sch}_k$ the category of all k -schemes, and by $\mathbf{Perf}_k$ the full subcategory consisting of perfect schemes. The inclusion functor $\mathbf{Perf}_k \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Sch}_k$ admits a right adjoint, which we call the *perfectization functor* and denote by $X \mapsto X_{\text{perf}}$. (This follows from the results of Greenberg [Gr65]. In our setup, k is algebraically closed, but, in fact, it suffices to assume that k is perfect.)

It is not hard to see that a group object in the category $\mathbf{Perf}_k$ is automatically a group scheme over k . Conversely, if G is any group scheme over k , then G_{perf} can be canonically equipped with a k -group scheme structure as well. For more details, we refer the reader to [Bo07, §§A.3–A.4].

Definitions 1.14. A *perfect quasi-algebraic scheme* over k is an object of $\mathbf{Perf}_k$ that is isomorphic to the perfectization of a scheme of finite type over k . A *perfect quasi-algebraic group* over k is a group object of $\mathbf{Perf}_k$ that is isomorphic to the perfectization of an algebraic group over k . For brevity, by a *perfect unipotent group* over k we will mean a perfect quasi-algebraic group over k that is isomorphic to the perfectization of a unipotent algebraic group over k .

Remark 1.15. If X is an arbitrary scheme over k , then, by adjunction, we obtain a canonical morphism $X_{\text{perf}} \rightarrow X$. It is known [Gr65] to be a homeomorphism of the underlying topological spaces. Furthermore, if $f : U \rightarrow X$ is an étale morphism, the induced morphism $U_{\text{perf}} \rightarrow U \times_X X_{\text{perf}}$ is an isomorphism, and the functor $U \mapsto U_{\text{perf}}$ induces an isomorphism between the étale topos of X and that of X_{perf} .

It follows that every construction that can be formulated in terms of the étale topos of a scheme is “insensitive” to replacing a scheme over k with its perfectization. In particular, if X is a perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k , the derived category $\mathcal{D}(X) = D_c^b(X, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ of X and the abelian category $\text{Perv}(X)$ of perverse sheaves on X can be defined in the same way as for schemes of finite type over k . We also have the formalism of the six functors (cf. §1.2) for the derived categories of perfect quasi-algebraic schemes over k . Further, if G is a perfect unipotent group acting on a quasi-algebraic scheme X over k , the equivariant derived category $\mathcal{D}_G(X)$ can be defined as in §1.3, and character sheaves on G can be defined as in §1.4. Moreover, every result about character sheaves on G (or, more generally, about the category $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$) that can be proved for perfect unipotent groups is also automatically valid for ordinary unipotent algebraic groups over k .

Convention 1.16. From now on, unless explicitly stated otherwise, all schemes under consideration will be assumed to be perfect schemes over k . This convention will allow us to simplify the formulation of all of our results that depend on Serre duality.

1.7. Serre duality and admissible pairs. We remain in the setup of §1.1. From the viewpoint of the sheaves-to-functions correspondence, the next definition is a geometric analogue of the notion of a 1-dimensional representation of a finite group.

Definition 1.17. A nonzero $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system $\mathcal{L}$ on a perfect quasi-algebraic group H over k is said to be *multiplicative* if $\mu^*(\mathcal{L}) \cong \mathcal{L} \boxtimes \mathcal{L}$, where $\mu : H \times_k H \rightarrow H$ denotes the multiplication morphism.

For our purposes, the *Serre dual* of H should be thought of as the moduli space of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on H . The idea of Serre duality for unipotent groups (not to be confused with Serre duality in the cohomology theory for coherent sheaves) goes back to the article [Se60], and is discussed in more detail in §3 below. For the time being, it will suffice to know that the Serre dual, H^* , of an arbitrary perfect *connected* unipotent group H exists as a (possibly disconnected) perfect commutative unipotent group over k (see Proposition 3.3).

Furthermore, the construction of the biadditive pairing B_χ that enters condition (2) in the definition of an admissible pair for a finite group (see #4 in §1.5) admits a geometrization, which plays a role in the definition of an admissible pair for a perfect unipotent group. This geometric construction is explained in more detail in §3.3. For the time being, we will use this construction as a “black box.”

Definition 1.18. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , and let $(H, \mathcal{L})$ be a pair consisting of a connected subgroup $H \subset G$ and a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{L}$ on H . The *normalizer* of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is defined as the stabilizer of the isomorphism class $[\mathcal{L}] \in H^*(k)$ in the normalizer³ $N_G(H) \subset G$ of H in G .

³Since H^* is defined by a universal property, the conjugation action of $N_G(H)$ on H induces an action of $N_G(H)$ on H^* . Note also that $[\mathcal{L}]$ is a point of H^* over k by the definition of H^* .

Definition 1.19. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k . An *admissible pair* for G is a pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ consisting of a connected subgroup $H \subset G$ and a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{L}$ on H such that the following three conditions are satisfied.

- (1) Let G' be the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G (see Definition 1.18), and let G'° denote its neutral connected component. Then G'°/H is commutative.
- (2) The k -group morphism $\varphi_{\mathcal{L}} : G'^{\circ}/H \rightarrow (G'^{\circ}/H)^*$, defined by applying the construction of §3.3 below to $U = Z = G'^{\circ}$, $N = H$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{L}$, is an isogeny.
- (3) For every $g \in G(k)$ such that $g \notin G'(k)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}|_{(H \cap H^g)^{\circ}} \not\cong \mathcal{L}^g|_{(H \cap H^g)^{\circ}},$$

where $H^g = g^{-1}Hg$ and $\mathcal{L}^g$ is the multiplicative local system on H^g obtained from $\mathcal{L}$ by transport of structure (via the map $h \mapsto g^{-1}hg$).

Remark 1.20. This notion is unrelated to Saibi's definition of an admissible pair of unipotent group schemes [Sa96, Def. 1.5.2(ii)].

1.8. Heisenberg minimal idempotents. The notion of an admissible pair allows us to construct a certain special class of minimal idempotents in equivariant derived categories of unipotent groups. Namely, let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $(H, \mathcal{L})$ be an admissible pair for G , and let G' be its normalizer in G , as defined above. Write $\mathbb{K}_H$ for the dualizing complex of H , which in our setup is isomorphic to $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}[2 \dim H]$, where $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_{\ell}$ is the constant ℓ -adic local system of rank 1 on H (because k is algebraically closed). Finally, put $e_{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{K}_H$, and let $e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ denote the object of $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ obtained from $e_{\mathcal{L}}$ by extension by zero. (Since $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is invariant under the conjugation action of G' , both $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathbb{K}_H$ have canonical G' -equivariant structures.)

Lemma 1.21. *The object $e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, which, moreover, is minimal as a weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$.*

The lemma results from [Bo07, Prop. 6.1(a)–(b)]. In what follows, we refer to $e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ as the *Heisenberg minimal idempotent* on G' defined by the admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$. As we will see shortly, one can obtain a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ from $e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ via “induction with compact supports” (cf. Theorem 1.26).

The following result covers the base case in the inductive proof of Theorem 1.13 that will be given in this article. It is proved in a forthcoming article [Desh].

Theorem 1.22. *If G' is a perfect unipotent group over k and $e'_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ is a Heisenberg minimal idempotent, Theorem 1.13 holds for $(G', e'_{\mathcal{L}})$ in place of (G, e) .*

1.9. Averaging functors and induction functors. We remain in the setup of §1.1. Let G be a perfect unipotent group acting on a perfect quasi-algebraic scheme X over k , and let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup. There is an obvious forgetful functor

$$\mathcal{D}_G(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(X). \quad (1.2)$$

The following result is standard (and easy to check).

Lemma 1.23. *The functor (1.2) has a right adjoint,*

$$\mathrm{Av}_{G/G'} : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(X).$$

Let us recall an explicit construction of the functor $\mathrm{Av}_{G/G'}$. As before, let us write $\alpha : G \times X \longrightarrow X$ for the action morphism, and $\pi : G \times X \longrightarrow X$ for the second projection.

We consider the left action of G' on $G \times X$ given by $g' \cdot (g, x) = (gg'^{-1}, g' \cdot x)$. The morphism $q : G \times X \longrightarrow (G/G') \times X$ given by $q(g, x) = (gG', g \cdot x)$ is clearly a quotient morphism for this action; in addition, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G \times X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X \\ & \searrow q & \nearrow \mathrm{pr}_2 \\ & (G/G') \times X & \end{array} \quad (1.3)$$

(where pr_2 denotes the second projection). On the other hand, the morphism π is equivariant for this action of G' on $G \times X$ and the given action of G' on X . Now, given $M \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(X)$, we obtain $\pi^*M \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G \times X)$, and, since the G' -action on $G \times X$ is free, we have $\pi^*M = q^*\tilde{M}$ for a unique (up to natural isomorphism) object $\tilde{M} \in \mathcal{D}((G/G') \times X)$. In other words, we described a functor $M \longmapsto \tilde{M}$ from the category $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(X)$ to the category $\mathcal{D}((G/G') \times X)$.

Furthermore, let us consider the actions of G on $G \times X$ and on $(G/G') \times X$ defined by $\gamma \cdot (g, x) = (\gamma g, x)$ and $\gamma \cdot (gG', x) = (\gamma gG', x)$, respectively. For these actions, the entire diagram (1.3) is G -equivariant. In addition, for any $M \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, the pullback π^*M automatically inherits a G -equivariant structure; if $M \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(X)$, then we obtain a $(G \times G')$ -equivariant structure on π^*M (because the actions of G and G' on $G \times X$ that we described commute with each other), and hence a G -equivariant structure on $\tilde{M}$. With this in mind, we set $\mathrm{Av}_{G/G'}(M) = \mathrm{pr}_{2*}\tilde{M} \in \mathcal{D}_G(X)$.

Definition 1.24. The functor $\mathrm{Av}_{G/G'}$ described above will be called the *averaging functor* (for the pair $G' \subset G$). We also introduce the functor $\mathrm{av}_{G/G'} : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(X)$ given by $\mathrm{av}_{G/G'}(M) = \mathrm{pr}_{2!}\tilde{M}$ and call it the *averaging with compact supports*. The natural morphism $\mathrm{pr}_{2!} \longrightarrow \mathrm{pr}_{2*}$ induces a natural morphism $\mathrm{av}_{G/G'} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Av}_{G/G'}$.

Definition 1.25. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , and let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup. Let G (respectively, G') act on itself by conjugation. Further, let $\iota : G' \hookrightarrow G$ denote the inclusion morphism. Then ι induces the functor

$$\iota_! = \iota_* : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G).$$

The functors of *induction* and *induction with compact supports* are defined by

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G = \mathrm{Av}_{G/G'} \circ \iota_* : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$$

and

$$\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G = \mathrm{av}_{G/G'} \circ \iota_* : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G),$$

respectively. By construction, we have a canonical morphism $\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G$. In addition, it follows from the earlier discussion that $\mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G$ is right adjoint to the restriction functor $\mathrm{Res}_{G'}^G : \mathcal{D}_G(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$.

1.10. Construction of L -packets. The two theorems we state next provide an explicit construction of all L -packets of character sheaves on a unipotent group over k , and show that there are “sufficiently many” character sheaves in a suitable sense.

Theorem 1.26. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k .*

- (a) *Let $(H, \mathcal{L})$ be an admissible pair for G (Def. 1.19), let G' be its normalizer in G (Def. 1.18), and let $e'_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be the corresponding Heisenberg minimal idempotent (§1.8). Then $f = \text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*
- (b) *With the notation of Theorem 1.13, $n_{e'_{\mathcal{L}}} = \dim H$ and $n_f = \dim H - \dim(G/G')$.*
- (c) *Every minimal closed idempotent $f \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ arises from an admissible pair by means of the construction described in part (a).*

For the proof, see §6.6.

Theorem 1.27. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k . Then*

- (a) *Every minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is minimal as a weak idempotent.*
- (b) *Every minimal weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is closed.*
- (c) *For every nonzero object $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, there exists a minimal closed idempotent $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ with $e * M \neq 0$.*

For the proof, see §6.4.

Remark 1.28. Parts (a) and (b) of the last theorem can be reformulated together as follows: the class of minimal weak idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ coincides with the class of minimal closed idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.

1.11. Some Mackey theory. We remain in the setup of §1.1. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , and let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup. The following notion is an obvious geometrization of the Mackey irreducibility criterion for induced characters of finite groups, as stated in #3 of §1.5.

Definition 1.29. A weak idempotent $e \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ is said to satisfy the *geometric Mackey condition* with respect to G if for every $x \in G(k) \setminus G'(k)$, we have $\bar{e} * \delta_x * \bar{e} = 0$, where $\delta_x \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ denotes the delta-sheaf at the point x , and $\bar{e}$ denotes the object of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ obtained by extending e to G by zero outside of G' .

The last main result of our work, proved in §6.5, is

Theorem 1.30. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup, let $e \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be a minimal closed idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G , and let $f = \text{ind}_{G'}^G e$. Then*

- (a) *f is a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$;*
- (b) *the functor $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ restricts to an equivalence $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \xrightarrow{\sim} f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$;*
- (c) *for every $M \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, the canonical arrow $\text{can}_M : \text{ind}_{G'}^G M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^G M$ is an isomorphism.*

1.12. Organization of the text. The rest of the article is organized as follows. In §2 we define and study the notion of a closed idempotent in an abstract monoidal category. We establish several general results that are used in the proofs of the main theorems of the paper. In §3 we recall the notion of Serre duality for perfect unipotent groups (in characteristic $p > 0$) and the definition of the Fourier-Deligne transform, mostly following [Sa96] and the relevant appendices in [BD06].

In §§4 and 5 we geometrize two standard results of character theory for finite nilpotent groups. First, if A is a finite abelian group acting on a set X , the resulting representation of A on the space of complex-valued functions on X can be naturally decomposed as a direct sum of 1-dimensional representations with the aid of the Fourier transform for A . The analogue of this result in the setting of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}$ -complexes, where A is replaced with a commutative unipotent group acting on an algebraic variety, is explained in §4 (it employs the Fourier-Deligne transform).

Next, a so-called “reduction process” for representations of finite nilpotent groups was explained in one of the appendices to [BD06]; we already alluded to it in §1.5 (#5). A partial geometrization thereof, namely, a geometric reduction process for representations of groups of the form $G_0(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where G_0 is a unipotent group over $\mathbb{F}_q$, was developed and utilized in [Bo07]. In §5 below we obtain a fully geometrized analogue, namely, a reduction process for objects of the category $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, where G is a unipotent group over k . It is crucial for the proof of Theorem 1.26(c).

Armed with the tools developed in §§2–5, we prove the main results stated earlier in this section in §6. Various technical details are relegated to the appendix. Our motivation behind having a separate appendix can, once again, be explained by analogy with a certain simple observation about characters of finite groups. Namely, if H is a finite abelian group, it is easy to understand all complex representations of H . If H is nonabelian, this is no longer the case. However, if we choose a subgroup $H_1 \subset H$ that contains the commutator $[H, H]$, and a homomorphism $\chi : H_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that $\chi|_{[H, H]} \equiv 1$, then it is easy to understand all representations of H whose restriction to H_1 is scalar, given by χ . In fact, the study of such representations can be easily reduced to the study of representations of the abelian group H/H_1 .

This observation has a geometric analogue, which is relevant for many auxiliary results of our work. We decided to collect all arguments that employ this observation in a separate appendix, since they carry no additional conceptual information and disrupt the natural flow of the parts of the paper in which they appear.

2. IDEMPOTENTS IN MONOIDAL CATEGORIES

2.1. Notation. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a monoidal category. By a slight abuse of notation, the underlying category will also be denoted by the letter $\mathcal{M}$. Unless indicated otherwise, the monoidal bifunctor on $\mathcal{M}$ will be denoted by $\otimes : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$, and the unit object will be denoted by $\mathbb{1} \in \mathcal{M}$. For $X \in \mathcal{M}$, the left and right unit isomorphisms will be denoted by $\lambda_X : \mathbb{1} \otimes X \xrightarrow{\sim} X$ and $\rho_X : X \otimes \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\sim} X$, respectively. Finally, given $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{M}$, we will write

$$\alpha_{X,Y,Z} : (X \otimes Y) \otimes Z \xrightarrow{\sim} X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)$$

for the corresponding associativity isomorphism.

2.2. Weak and closed idempotents; idempotent arrows. We now introduce the central notions of the present section.

Definitions 2.1. (a) An object $e \in \mathcal{M}$ is said to be a *weak idempotent* if $e \otimes e \cong e$.
 (b) A morphism $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ in $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be an *idempotent arrow* if both of the induced morphisms

$$\mathbb{1} \otimes e \xrightarrow{\pi \otimes \text{id}_e} e \otimes e \quad \text{and} \quad e \otimes \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_e \otimes \pi} e \otimes e \quad (2.1)$$

are isomorphisms.

(c) An object $e \in \mathcal{M}$ is said to be a *closed idempotent* if there exists an idempotent arrow $\mathbb{1} \longrightarrow e$.

Remarks 2.2. (1) All three notions introduced above are independent of the unit constraints and the associativity constraint for the monoidal bifunctor $\otimes$ on $\mathcal{M}$.

(2) To explain the term “closed,” consider the following example. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the category of sheaves of complex vector spaces on a topological space X with the usual tensor product bifunctor, let $\iota : Y \hookrightarrow X$ denote the inclusion of a subspace, and let $\mathbb{C}_Y$ denote the constant sheaf with stalks $\mathbb{C}$ on Y . Then $\iota_! \mathbb{C}_Y$ is a weak idempotent in $\mathcal{M}$. In addition, if Y is closed in X , then $\iota_! = \iota_*$, and by adjunction, we obtain a morphism $\mathbb{C}_X \longrightarrow \iota_* \mathbb{C}_Y$, which is easily seen to be an idempotent arrow (note that $\mathbb{C}_X$ is a unit object of $\mathcal{M}$).

(3) A closed idempotent is, *a fortiori*, a weak idempotent. The converse is usually false. For instance, if, in the situation above, Y is *not* closed in X , then $\iota_! \mathbb{C}_Y$ is *not* a closed idempotent in X . To see this, it suffices to recall that for any object $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{M}$, morphisms $\mathbb{C}_X \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}$ correspond to global sections of $\mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, it is obvious that if a section $s \in \Gamma(X, \iota_! \mathbb{C}_Y)$ defines an idempotent arrow $\mathbb{C}_X \longrightarrow \iota_! \mathbb{C}_Y$, then the support of s must be equal to Y . However, the support of any section of a sheaf is necessarily closed.

(4) In the definition of an idempotent arrow, it does *not* suffice to require either of the two morphisms (2.1) to be an isomorphism (cf. [BoDr, Rem. 2.3]).

- (5) The notion of a weak idempotent is not very convenient from the categorical viewpoint. In particular, if e is a weak idempotent in a monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$, then, in general, we are not aware of any useful uniqueness statements about an isomorphism between e and $e \otimes e$. On the other hand, the notion of a closed idempotent is much more rigid: for instance, in the situation of Definition 2.1(c), the arrow π is determined uniquely up to a unique automorphism of e . Other useful rigidity results are obtained in §2.4 below. Nevertheless, the interplay between weak and closed idempotents, explored in §2.7, will become important in the proofs of the main results of our article (cf. §6).

2.3. Closed idempotents via adjoint functors. Among the most prominent examples of monoidal categories are the categories of endofunctors. Specifically, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a (small) category, the category $\text{End}(\mathcal{C})$ of functors $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a strictly associative and strictly unital monoidal category with respect to composition of functors. Closed idempotents in this category were studied, under the name *idempotent monads*, in a number of earlier works, among which we mention [Ad73, DFH74, DFH75]. In this subsection we summarize the basic facts relating idempotent monads to the notions of adjoint functors and reflective subcategories, mostly following [KS06, §4.1] (the term “projector” is used in *loc. cit.* in place of “idempotent monad”).

Let us first recall the following

Definition 2.3. A subcategory $\mathcal{D}$ of a category $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be *reflective* if the inclusion functor $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ admits a left adjoint.

Proposition 2.4. (a) *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a category, let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}$ be a full reflective subcategory, and let $L : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a left adjoint of the inclusion functor $I : \mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Further, let us denote the adjunction morphisms by $\eta : L \circ I \rightarrow \text{Id}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\epsilon : \text{Id}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow I \circ L$. Then η is an isomorphism, and ϵ is an idempotent arrow in the category of endofunctors of $\mathcal{C}$.*

- (b) *Conversely, let $P : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a functor, and let $\epsilon : \text{Id}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow P$ denote an idempotent arrow in the category of endofunctors of $\mathcal{C}$. Given an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$, the following three statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *the arrow $\epsilon_X : X \rightarrow P(X)$ is an isomorphism;*
- (ii) *for any $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, the map $\text{Hom}(P(Y), X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(Y, X)$ given by $f \mapsto f \circ \epsilon_Y$ is bijective;*
- (iii) *the map in (ii) is surjective for $Y = X$.*

If $\mathcal{D}$ is the full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects $X \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfying the equivalent conditions (i)–(iii), then $P(X) \in \mathcal{D}$ for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, P induces a functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ which is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. A fortiori, $\mathcal{D}$ is a reflective subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$.

This result is contained in Propositions 4.1.3–4.1.4 of [KS06].

2.4. Rigidity of closed idempotents. Until the end of the section, $\mathcal{M}$ will denote a fixed monoidal category, and the notation introduced in §2.1 will remain in force. Given a weak idempotent $e \in \mathcal{M}$, we define three full subcategories,

$$e\mathcal{M}, \quad \mathcal{M}e \quad \text{and} \quad e\mathcal{M}e,$$

of $\mathcal{M}$, as follows:

$$e\mathcal{M} = \{X \in \mathcal{M} \mid e \otimes X \cong X\}, \quad \mathcal{M}e = \{X \in \mathcal{M} \mid X \otimes e \cong X\},$$

and

$$e\mathcal{M}e = \{X \in \mathcal{M} \mid e \otimes X \otimes e \cong X\}.$$

To explain the notation, we make the trivial observation that an object X of $\mathcal{M}$ lies in $e\mathcal{M}$ if and only if $X \cong e \otimes Y$ for some $Y \in \mathcal{M}$, and analogous comments are valid for the subcategories $\mathcal{M}e$ and $e\mathcal{M}e$ as well.

If e is a closed idempotent, it is easy to see that the subcategories we just defined admit the following alternate description.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ be an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$. An object X of $\mathcal{M}$ lies in $e\mathcal{M}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{M}e$) if and only if the morphism $\pi \otimes \text{id}_X : \mathbb{1} \otimes X \longrightarrow e \otimes X$ (respectively, $\text{id}_X \otimes \pi : X \otimes \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow X \otimes e$) is an isomorphism.*

The “if” part is obvious from the definitions, while the “only if” part follows by writing $X \cong e \otimes Y$ (respectively, $X \cong Y \otimes e$) for some $Y \in \mathcal{M}$ and applying the definition of an idempotent arrow. Lemma 2.5 will be implicitly used in various arguments that appear below without further mention.

We will next prove several uniqueness results, culminating in Proposition 2.9.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ be an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$, let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ be arbitrary, and let $X \in \mathcal{M}e$. If $f, g : M \otimes e \longrightarrow X$ are two morphisms such that*

$$f \circ (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi) = g \circ (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi) : M \otimes \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow X,$$

then $f = g$.

Thus the arrow $\text{id}_M \otimes \pi : M \otimes \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow M \otimes e$ enjoys a certain weakening of the property of being a categorical epimorphism. The dual version of the lemma, where $X \in e\mathcal{M}$ and $\text{id}_M \otimes \pi$ is replaced by $\pi \otimes \text{id}_M$, also holds.

Proof. The assumption implies that

$$(f \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_e) = (g \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ (\text{id}_M \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_e) : M \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes e \longrightarrow X \otimes e.$$

Since $\pi \otimes \text{id}_e$, and hence also $\text{id}_M \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_e$, is an isomorphism, it follows that

$$f \otimes \text{id}_e = g \otimes \text{id}_e : M \otimes e \otimes e \longrightarrow X \otimes e.$$

On the other hand, since $X \in \mathcal{M}e$, the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M \otimes e \otimes \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{f \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}} & X \otimes \mathbb{1} \\
 \text{id}_M \otimes \text{id}_e \otimes \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \text{id}_X \otimes \pi \\
 M \otimes e \otimes e & \xrightarrow{f \otimes \text{id}_e} & X \otimes e
 \end{array}$$

shows that $f \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}}$, and hence f , is determined by $f \otimes \text{id}_e$:

$$f \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}} = (\text{id}_X \otimes \pi)^{-1} \circ (f \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ (\text{id}_{M \otimes e} \otimes \pi).$$

Since the roles of f and g can be interchanged, it follows that $f = g$. $\square$

Corollary 2.7. *If $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ is an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$ and $f : e \rightarrow e$ is a morphism such that $f \circ \pi = \pi$, then $f = \text{id}_e$. (In particular, an idempotent arrow has no nontrivial automorphisms.)*

Proof. Apply the lemma to the special case $M = \mathbb{1}$ (identifying $\mathbb{1} \otimes e$ with e) and $X = e$, with f being the given morphism and $g = \text{id}_e$. $\square$

The following construction will be used in the proofs of Propositions 2.8 and 2.9, appearing below. Consider two arrows, $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ and $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi'} e'$, in $\mathcal{M}$, which are not necessarily idempotent. We define a new arrow, denoted $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi\pi'} e \otimes e'$, via

$$\pi\pi' := (\pi \otimes \pi') \circ \lambda_{\mathbb{1}}^{-1} = (\pi \otimes \pi') \circ \rho_{\mathbb{1}}^{-1} : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} \rightarrow e \otimes e'. \quad (2.2)$$

The commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\pi \otimes \pi'} & e \otimes e' \\
 \text{id}_{\mathbb{1}} \otimes \pi' \searrow & & \nearrow \pi \otimes \text{id}_{e'} \\
 \lambda_{\mathbb{1}} \downarrow & \mathbb{1} \otimes e' & \\
 \downarrow & \downarrow \lambda_{e'} & \\
 \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\pi'} & e'
 \end{array}$$

leads to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\pi\pi'} & e \otimes e' \\
 \pi' \searrow & & \nearrow (\pi \otimes \text{id}_{e'}) \circ \lambda_{e'}^{-1} \\
 & e' &
 \end{array} \quad (2.3)$$

By symmetry, we also have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{1} & \xrightarrow{\pi\pi'} & e \otimes e' \\ & \searrow \pi & \nearrow (\text{id}_e \otimes \pi') \circ \rho_e^{-1} \\ & e & \end{array} \quad (2.4)$$

As a first application of this construction, we prove that, given an idempotent arrow $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$, the resulting isomorphism $e \xrightarrow{\sim} e \otimes e$ is defined unambiguously.

Proposition 2.8. *If $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ is an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$, then the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbb{1} \otimes e & \\ \lambda_e^{-1} \nearrow & & \searrow \pi \otimes \text{id}_e \\ e & & e \otimes e \\ \rho_e^{-1} \searrow & & \nearrow \text{id}_e \otimes \pi \\ & e \otimes \mathbb{1} & \end{array} \quad (2.5)$$

Proof. We apply the above construction to $e' = e$, $\pi' = \pi$. By assumption, both $\pi \otimes \text{id}_e$ and $\text{id}_e \otimes \pi$ are isomorphisms; thus (2.3) and (2.4) together imply that

$$[(\text{id}_e \otimes \pi) \circ \rho_e^{-1}]^{-1} \circ [(\pi \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ \lambda_e^{-1}] \circ \pi = \pi.$$

In view of Corollary 2.7, this proves the proposition. $\square$

We are now ready to prove that an idempotent $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ is determined by its codomain up to unique isomorphism. We begin with

Proposition 2.9. *If $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ is an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$, then the map*

$$\pi^* : \text{Hom}(e, e) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{1}, e), \quad f \longmapsto f \circ \pi,$$

is bijective.

Proof. The fact that π^* is injective results from Lemma 2.6. To prove that π^* is surjective, consider an arbitrary morphism $\pi' : \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow e$. We apply the construction (2.2) to $e' = e$ and the two morphisms π and π' . Even though the map $\text{id}_e \otimes \pi'$ may not be an isomorphism, the map $\pi \otimes \text{id}_e$ still is, so we obtain

$$\pi' = [(\pi \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ \lambda_e^{-1}]^{-1} \circ [(\text{id}_e \otimes \pi') \circ \rho_e^{-1}] \circ \pi,$$

proving the surjectivity of π^* . $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *If $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ and $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi'} e$ are two idempotents in $\mathcal{M}$ with the same codomain e , then there exists a unique morphism $\sigma : e \longrightarrow e$ such that $\pi' = \sigma \circ \pi$. Furthermore, σ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. The first statement is a special case of Proposition 2.9. The second statement follows since the roles of π and π' can be interchanged. $\square$

2.5. Hecke subcategories. We remain in the setup of §2.1. Let $\mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\pi} e$ be an idempotent arrow in $\mathcal{M}$. In §2.4 we introduced the full subcategory $e\mathcal{M}e \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ consisting of all objects X of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $X \cong e \otimes X \otimes e$. It is clear that $e\mathcal{M}e$ is closed under $\otimes$. By abuse of notation, we will denote by $\otimes$ the induced bifunctor on $e\mathcal{M}e$, and by α the induced associativity constraint on $e\mathcal{M}e$. Moreover, for every object X of $e\mathcal{M}e$ we define isomorphisms

$$\lambda_X^\pi = \lambda_X \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_X)^{-1} : e \otimes X \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{1} \otimes X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$$

and

$$\rho_X^\pi = \rho_X \circ (\text{id}_X \otimes \pi)^{-1} : X \otimes e \xrightarrow{\cong} X \otimes \mathbb{1} \xrightarrow{\cong} X.$$

Proposition 2.11. *The category $e\mathcal{M}e = (e\mathcal{M}e, \otimes, e, \alpha, \lambda^\pi, \rho^\pi)$ is monoidal.*

Proof. The fact that the induced associativity constraint α on $e\mathcal{M}e$ satisfies the pentagon axiom is automatic. Thus we need to verify the following two conditions:

(i) for all $X, Y \in e\mathcal{M}e$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X \otimes e) \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{X,e,Y}} & X \otimes (e \otimes Y) \\ & \searrow \rho_X^\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y & \swarrow \text{id}_X \otimes \lambda_Y^\pi \\ & X \otimes Y & \end{array} \quad (2.6)$$

commutes, and

(ii) we have $\lambda_e^\pi = \rho_e^\pi : e \otimes e \longrightarrow e$.

Now property (ii) is the content of Proposition 2.8. To prove (i), we expand the diagram (2.6) into

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X \otimes e) \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{X,e,Y}} & X \otimes (e \otimes Y) \\ \downarrow (\text{id}_X \otimes \pi)^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_Y & & \downarrow \text{id}_X \otimes (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1} \\ (X \otimes \mathbb{1}) \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{X,\mathbb{1},Y}} & X \otimes (\mathbb{1} \otimes Y) \\ & \searrow \rho_X \otimes \text{id}_Y & \swarrow \text{id}_X \otimes \lambda_Y \\ & X \otimes Y & \end{array}$$

The commutativity of the top square follows from the naturality of the associativity constraint α , and the commutativity of the bottom triangle is the “triangle axiom” for the monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$. $\square$

Remark 2.12. In view of Corollary 2.10, the category $e\mathcal{M}e$ depends only on the closed idempotent e and not on the choice of the arrow π (up to equivalence of monoidal categories).

We call $e\mathcal{M}e$ the *Hecke subcategory* of $\mathcal{M}$ corresponding to the closed idempotent e , by analogy with the term *Hecke subalgebra*, used for the subring eAe in a ring A associated to an idempotent $e \in A$.

Convention 2.13. If e is a weak idempotent in a monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$, we still call $e\mathcal{M}e$ the *Hecke subcategory* of $\mathcal{M}$ defined by e . However, it is important to remember that, in general, $e\mathcal{M}e$ may fail to be a monoidal category. More precisely, even though $e\mathcal{M}e$ is always closed under $\otimes$, and α restricts to an associativity constraint on $e\mathcal{M}e$, the “semigroupal” category $(e\mathcal{M}e, \otimes, \alpha)$ may fail to possess a unit object (see [BoDr]).

2.6. Minimal idempotents. We remain in the setup of §2.1. As we prove in [BoDr], there exists a canonical partial order on the set of isomorphism classes of closed idempotents in an arbitrary monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{M}$ has a zero object, the notion of a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{M}$ can be defined.

However, for our purposes, it suffices to work in a more restrictive setup:

Definition 2.14. A monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be *weakly symmetric* if the functors $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ given by $(X, Y) \mapsto X \otimes Y$ and $(X, Y) \mapsto Y \otimes X$ are isomorphic. (The terminology “weakly symmetric” may be non-standard.)

For example, a braided monoidal category is weakly symmetric. In general, if $\mathcal{M}$ is weakly symmetric and $e \in \mathcal{M}$ is a weak idempotent, it is clear that all three subcategories $e\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}e$ and $e\mathcal{M}e$ of $\mathcal{M}$ coincide. Normally, we will write $e\mathcal{M}$ for the Hecke subcategory of $\mathcal{M}$ defined by e (cf. Convention 2.13) in this situation.

Definition 2.15. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weakly symmetric monoidal category that has a zero object⁴, 0 . A *minimal closed* (respectively, *weak*) *idempotent* in $\mathcal{M}$ is a closed (respectively, weak) idempotent $e \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $e \neq 0$, and such that for every closed (respectively, weak) idempotent $e' \in \mathcal{M}$, we have either $e \otimes e' = 0$, or $e \otimes e' \cong e$.

Remark 2.16. A minimal closed idempotent might fail to be minimal as a weak idempotent. On the other hand, if a minimal weak idempotent happens to be a closed idempotent, then it is clearly minimal as a closed idempotent as well.

The following trivial observation is occasionally useful.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weakly symmetric monoidal category with a zero object, 0 . A closed idempotent $e \in \mathcal{M}$ is minimal among closed idempotents if and only if $e \neq 0$ and the Hecke subcategory $e\mathcal{M}$ has no closed idempotents (up to isomorphism) apart from 0 and its unit object, e . Similarly, a weak idempotent $e \in \mathcal{M}$ is minimal among weak idempotents if and only if $e \neq 0$ and every nonzero weak idempotent in the Hecke subcategory $e\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is isomorphic to e .*

⁴In all the applications we have in mind, $\mathcal{M}$ will in fact be additive.

2.7. Adjunction properties. The following “abstract nonsense” result will play an important role in the proof of Proposition 6.6.

Proposition 2.18. (a) *If e is a closed idempotent in a monoidal category $\mathcal{M}$, then the functor $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow e\mathcal{M}$ given by $X \mapsto e \otimes X$ is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $e\mathcal{M} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$.*

(b) *Here is a partial converse. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weakly symmetric monoidal category, and let $e \in \mathcal{M}$ be a weak idempotent. Suppose that the functor $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow e\mathcal{M}$ given by $X \mapsto e \otimes X$ is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $e\mathcal{M} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$. Then e is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.18(a). We will exhibit the desired adjunction between the two functors explicitly. Given $X \in \mathcal{M}$ and $Y \in e\mathcal{M}$, we define a map

$$\eta_{X,Y} : \text{Hom}(e \otimes X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(X, Y)$$

by

$$\eta_{X,Y}(\varphi) = \varphi \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ \lambda_X^{-1} : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes X \longrightarrow e \otimes X \xrightarrow{\varphi} Y,$$

and we define a map

$$\tau_{X,Y} : \text{Hom}(X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(e \otimes X, Y)$$

by

$$\tau_{X,Y}(\psi) \longmapsto \lambda_Y \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1} \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \psi) : e \otimes X \longrightarrow e \otimes Y \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes Y \longrightarrow Y.$$

It is obvious that $\eta_{X,Y}$ and $\tau_{X,Y}$ are functorial with respect to X and Y , so the proof of statement (a) will be complete once we show that these two maps are inverse to each other. To this end, we note that we may assume the monoidal bifunctor $\otimes$ to be *strictly associative* (both on objects and on morphisms). Indeed, the general case immediately reduces to this one, since an arbitrary monoidal category is known to be equivalent to a strictly associative one, and the definitions of $\eta_{X,Y}$ and $\tau_{X,Y}$ do not make use of the associativity constraint α .

To prove that $\eta_{X,Y}$ and $\tau_{X,Y}$ are inverse to each other, we first calculate, for $\psi \in \text{Hom}(X, Y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{X,Y}(\tau_{X,Y}(\psi)) &= \lambda_Y \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1} \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \psi) \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ \lambda_X^{-1} \\ &= \lambda_Y \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1} \circ (\pi \otimes \psi) \circ \lambda_X^{-1} \\ &= \lambda_Y \circ (\text{id}_{\mathbb{1}} \otimes \psi) \circ \lambda_X^{-1} = \psi. \end{aligned}$$

To justify this calculation, observe that the first and third equalities follow from the naturality of λ and $\otimes$, while the second equality follows by composing both sides of

$$\pi \otimes \psi = (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ (\text{id}_{\mathbb{1}} \otimes \psi)$$

with $(\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1}$ on the left.

Next, given $\varphi \in \text{Hom}(e \otimes X, Y)$, we must prove that

$$\lambda_Y \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y)^{-1} \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \varphi) \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \lambda_X^{-1}) = \varphi.$$

Since $Y \in e\mathcal{M}$, we may compose the last equality with $(\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ \lambda_Y^{-1}$ on the left without affecting its validity or invalidity. This results in the equality

$$(\text{id}_e \otimes \varphi) \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \lambda_X^{-1}) = (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ \lambda_Y^{-1} \circ \varphi. \quad (2.7)$$

Using the naturality of λ , the right hand side of (2.7) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi \otimes \text{id}_Y) \circ \lambda_Y^{-1} \circ \varphi &= (\pi \otimes \varphi) \circ \lambda_{e \otimes X}^{-1} \\ &= (\text{id}_e \otimes \varphi) \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_{e \otimes X}) \circ \lambda_{e \otimes X}^{-1} \\ &= (\text{id}_e \otimes \varphi) \circ (\pi \otimes \text{id}_e \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ (\lambda_e^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_X). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, in view of the “triangle axiom”, the left hand side of (2.7) equals

$$(\text{id}_e \otimes \varphi) \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \pi \otimes \text{id}_X) \circ (\rho_e^{-1} \otimes \text{id}_X).$$

Comparing the last two expressions and using the identity

$$(\text{id}_e \otimes \pi) \circ \rho_e^{-1} = (\pi \otimes \text{id}_e) \circ \lambda_e^{-1}$$

(obtained in Proposition 2.8) finishes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.18(b). As above, we may suppose that the bifunctor $\otimes$ is strictly associative. By assumption, there exists a bifunctorial family of bijections

$$\tau_{X,Y} : \text{Hom}(X, Y) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}(e \otimes X, Y) \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{M}, Y \in e\mathcal{M}.$$

Let η and ϵ denote the corresponding adjunction morphisms. To be more explicit, for every $Y \in e\mathcal{M}$, we obtain a morphism $\eta_Y : e \otimes Y \longrightarrow Y$ (natural in Y) with the property that $\tau_{X,Y}(\psi) = \eta_Y \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \psi)$ for every $X \in \mathcal{M}$ and every $\psi \in \text{Hom}(X, Y)$. Also, for every $X \in \mathcal{M}$, we obtain a morphism $\epsilon_X : X \longrightarrow e \otimes X$ (natural in X) determined by the identity $\tau_{X,e \otimes X}(\epsilon_X) = \text{id}_{e \otimes X}$.

By both parts of Proposition 2.4, the morphisms η_Y and ϵ_Y are isomorphisms for every $Y \in e\mathcal{M}$. The identity

$$\text{id}_{e \otimes X} = \tau_{X,e \otimes X}(\epsilon_X) = \eta_{e \otimes X} \circ (\text{id}_e \otimes \epsilon_X)$$

now implies that $\text{id}_e \otimes \epsilon_X : e \otimes X \longrightarrow e \otimes e \otimes X$ is an isomorphism for every $X \in \mathcal{M}$. Taking $X = \mathbb{1}$, we obtain a morphism $\epsilon_{\mathbb{1}} : \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \otimes e$, and if we put $\pi = \lambda_e^{-1} \circ \epsilon_{\mathbb{1}}$, we see that $\text{id}_e \otimes \pi$ is an isomorphism. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is assumed to be weakly symmetric, we see that $\pi \otimes \text{id}_e$ is an isomorphism as well, which means that π is an idempotent arrow and completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

3. SERRE DUALITY AND FOURIER-DELIGNE TRANSFORM

3.1. Definition of the Serre dual. We keep the assumptions of §1.1 (although, in fact, it would suffice to require the field k to be perfect throughout this section). In particular, $\text{char } k = p > 0$, and ℓ is a fixed prime different from p .

The notion of a multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system on a perfect quasi-algebraic group over k was introduced in Definition 1.17. In order to formulate the definition of the Serre dual of a connected perfect unipotent group, we need a relative version:

Definition 3.1. Let H be a perfect quasi-algebraic group over k , and let S be a perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k . A *family of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on H parameterized by S* is a nonzero $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system $\mathcal{L}$ on $H \times_k S$ such that $\mu_{12}^*(\mathcal{L}) \cong p_{13}^*(\mathcal{L}) \otimes p_{23}^*(\mathcal{L})$, where

$$\mu_{12} = \mu_H \times \text{id}_S : H \times_k H \times_k S \longrightarrow H \times_k S$$

(with μ_H being the multiplication morphism for H) and

$$p_{13}, p_{23} : H \times_k H \times_k S \longrightarrow H \times_k S$$

are the projections along the second and first factor, respectively.

Remark 3.2. It is clear that if $\mathcal{L}$ is as above, then $\mathcal{L}$ has rank 1, and hence that isomorphism classes of S -families of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on H form an abelian group under tensor product.

Proposition 3.3. *Let H be a (possibly noncommutative) connected perfect unipotent group over k . There exists a (possibly disconnected) perfect commutative unipotent group H^* over k and an H^* -family $\mathcal{E}$ of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on H with the following universal property.*

If S is a perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k , the map $f \mapsto (\text{id}_H \times f)^ \mathcal{E}$ is an isomorphism between the group of k -morphisms $f : S \longrightarrow H^*$ and the group of isomorphism classes of S -families of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on H .*

In the case where H is commutative, the idea of this construction goes back to Serre's article [Se60], and the result itself is proved in [Be80]. For the proof in general, we refer the reader to the appendix in [Bo07].

Definition 3.4. The pair $(H^*, \mathcal{E})$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 3.3 is called a *Serre dual* of H . Of course, it is determined uniquely up to unique isomorphism. As usual, by abuse of terminology, we will often refer to H^* itself as the Serre dual of H , in which case $\mathcal{E}$ will be called “the universal local system on $H \times_k H^*$ ”.

3.2. Properties of Serre duality. Serre duality for perfect connected unipotent groups has several properties that are similar to the properties of the functor $\Gamma \mapsto \Gamma^*$, where Γ is an arbitrary finite group and $\Gamma^* = \text{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathbb{C}^\times)$. The first one and the third one follow easily from the definition of the Serre dual.

- (1) Serre duality, $H \mapsto H^*$, is a contravariant functor from the category $\mathbf{pu}_k^\circ$ of perfect connected unipotent groups over k to the category $\mathbf{cpu}_k$ of commutative perfect unipotent groups over k .
- (2) If $H \in \mathbf{pu}_k^\circ$ and $H^{ab} = H/[H, H]$ is the abelianization of H , then the induced morphism $(H^{ab})^* \rightarrow H^*$ is a monomorphism, and identifies $(H^{ab})^*$ with the neutral connected component of H^* (cf. [Bo07, Prop. A.30]).
- (3) If $G \rightarrow H \rightarrow K \rightarrow 1$ is an exact sequence of perfect connected unipotent groups over k , the induced sequence $0 \rightarrow K^* \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow G^*$ of commutative perfect unipotent groups is also exact.
- (4) The restriction of the functor $H \mapsto H^*$ to the category $\mathbf{cpu}_k^\circ = \mathbf{pu}_k^\circ \cap \mathbf{cpu}_k$ of perfect connected commutative unipotent groups over k is an exact⁵ equivalence between $\mathbf{cpu}_k^\circ$ and its opposite category. Furthermore, the square of this restriction is naturally isomorphic to the identity functor on $\mathbf{cpu}_k^\circ$ (cf. [Se60, Be80]).

3.3. An auxiliary construction. In this subsection we recall a construction that was introduced in [Bo07, §A.13], which plays an important role in the definition of an admissible pair (§1.7) and in the proofs appearing in §5.

Let U be a (possibly disconnected and/or noncommutative) perfect unipotent group, and let $N \subset U$ be a normal connected subgroup. Since the Serre dual, N^* , of N is defined by a universal property, it is clear that U acts on N^* by k -group scheme automorphisms. Now let $\mathcal{N}$ be a multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system on N such that the corresponding element of $N^*(k)$ is U -invariant. Further, let $Z \subset U$ be a connected subgroup such that⁶ $N \subset Z$ and $[U, Z] \subset N$.

It is shown in [Bo07, §A.13] that $\mathcal{N}$ defines a k -group scheme morphism

$$\varphi_{\mathcal{N}} : U/N \rightarrow (Z/N)^*.$$

Here we will merely recall the construction of a k -scheme morphism $\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathcal{N}} : U \rightarrow Z^*$; we refer the reader to *loc. cit.* for the proof of the fact that $\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a group scheme morphism, and that it factors (necessarily uniquely) as a composition

$$\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathcal{N}} : U \rightarrow U/N \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathcal{N}}} (Z/N)^* \rightarrow Z^*.$$

To define $\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathcal{N}}$, it suffices, by definition, to specify a U -family of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on Z . To this end, let $c : U \times_k Z \rightarrow N$ denote the commutator morphism, $c(u, z) = uzu^{-1}z^{-1}$, and let $\mathcal{L} = c^*\mathcal{N}$. It is proved in *loc. cit.* that $\mathcal{L}$ is indeed a U -family of multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local systems on Z . This family defines the desired morphism $\tilde{\varphi}_{\mathcal{N}} : U \rightarrow Z^*$.

⁵Note that $\mathbf{cpu}_k$ is an abelian category, and $\mathbf{cpu}_k^\circ$ is an exact subcategory of $\mathbf{cpu}_k$.

⁶Without loss of generality, one can take Z to be the preimage in U of the neutral connected component of the center of U/N .

3.4. The Fourier-Deligne transform. The Fourier-Deligne transform was first introduced by Deligne in [De76]. In the remainder of this section we present a slight generalization of Deligne's definition, and recall some of its main properties, mostly following [Sa96] and the appendices in [BD06].

Let H be a perfect connected unipotent group over k , and let S be an arbitrary perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k . Let us fix a Serre dual, $(H^*, \mathcal{E})$, of H , and let $\mathcal{E}_S$ denote the pullback of $\mathcal{E}$ to $H \times_k H^* \times_k S$. Further, let $\text{pr} : H \times_k H^* \rightarrow H$ and $\text{pr}' : H \times_k H^* \rightarrow H^*$ denote the first and second projection morphisms. We define a triangulated functor

$$\mathcal{F}_S : \mathcal{D}(H \times_k S) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(H^* \times_k S),$$

called the *Fourier-Deligne transform* (relative to S), by

$$\mathcal{F}_S(M) = (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_S)_! (\mathcal{E}_S \otimes (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_S)^* M)[d],$$

where $d = \dim H$ and $[d]$ denotes the cohomological shift by d to the left. We also define another functor,

$$\mathcal{F}_{S,*} : \mathcal{D}(H \times_k S) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(H^* \times_k S),$$

by the formula

$$\mathcal{F}_{S,*}(M) = (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_S)_* (\mathcal{E}_S \otimes (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_S)^* M)[d].$$

In particular, we obtain a canonical morphism of functors $\mathcal{F}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{S,*}$.

3.5. Main properties of $\mathcal{F}$. Throughout this section, we assume that H is a *commutative connected perfect unipotent group over k* . The proofs of the following facts can all be found in [Sa96]. We refer the reader to the appendix on the Fourier-Deligne transform in [BD06] for a more detailed discussion and historical comments.

- (1) The functor $\mathcal{F}_S$ is an equivalence of categories. A quasi-inverse functor can also be expressed in terms of a Fourier-Deligne transform. More precisely,

$$\mathcal{F}_S^{-1} : N \mapsto ((\iota \times \text{id}_S)^* \mathcal{F}'_S(N))(d),$$

where (d) is the d -th Tate twist⁷, $\iota : H \rightarrow H$ is the inversion map (given by $h \mapsto h^{-1}$), and

$$\mathcal{F}'_S(N) = (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_S)_! (\mathcal{E}_S \otimes (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_S)^* N)[d].$$

- (2) The canonical natural transformation $\mathcal{F}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{S,*}$ is an isomorphism of functors.
 (3) $\mathcal{F}_S$ takes perverse sheaves to perverse sheaves.

If H is not assumed to be commutative, all these properties will fail. On the other hand, we explain in the Appendix that the functor $\mathcal{F}_S$ can be exploited in the noncommutative setting by restricting it to suitable subcategories of $\mathcal{D}(H \times_k S)$.

⁷Since k is assumed to be algebraically closed, the Tate twist can be trivialized (noncanonically).

4. FOURIER DECOMPOSITION IN A GEOMETRIC SETTING

4.1. Motivation. Every complex representation of a finite abelian group A can be decomposed into a direct sum of 1-dimensional representations of A . In the case where the representation arises from an action of A on a certain set X , this decomposition can be described in terms of an isomorphism between the spaces of functions on $A \times X$ and on $A^* \times X$. Here, A^* is the Pontryagin dual of A , and the said isomorphism is defined via taking the Fourier transform along the first factor.

This observation, which is explained in more detail in §4.2, admits a geometric analogue, which is the subject of the present section. The latter result, apart from being interesting in its own right, is also important for the following reason. Given a (perfect) connected commutative unipotent group A acting on a (perfect) scheme X of (quasi-)finite type over k , we are able to isolate a certain class of ℓ -adic complexes N on $A^* \times X$ — the “quasi-equivariant ones” — which have the property that the canonical arrow $\Pi_! N \rightarrow \Pi_* N$ is an isomorphism, where $\Pi : A^* \times X \rightarrow X$ is the second projection (see Theorem 4.2(c)). A slight generalization of this result, which is relegated to the Appendix, plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.30.

4.2. Fourier decomposition in the purely algebraic setting. Let A be a finite abelian group acting on a set X . We write $\text{Fun}(X)$ for the vector space of functions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; it is a representation of A , where the action is given by

$$(a \cdot f)(x) = f(a^{-1}x), \quad a \in A, f \in \text{Fun}(X), x \in X.$$

Since A is abelian, this representation decomposes as a direct sum of 1-dimensional representations of A . This decomposition is called the Fourier decomposition of $\text{Fun}(X)$ with respect to the action of A . As a warmup, we will rewrite the standard description of this decomposition in a way that admits a natural geometric analogue (which is the main goal of the present section).

Let $A^* = \text{Hom}(A, \mathbb{C}^\times)$ denote the Pontryagin dual of A . The most direct way to formulate the Fourier decomposition of $\text{Fun}(X)$ is by means of the equality

$$\text{Fun}(X) = \bigoplus_{\chi \in A^*} \text{Fun}(X)^{A, \chi} \quad (4.1)$$

(internal direct sum of vector spaces), where

$$\text{Fun}(X)^{A, \chi} = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid f(a^{-1}x) = \chi(a)f(x) \quad \forall a \in A, x \in X\}.$$

Next we reformulate the statement above in a different way. Let us say that a function $f : A^* \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is *quasi-invariant* if it satisfies

$$f(\chi, a^{-1}x) = \chi(a) \cdot f(\chi, x) \quad \forall \chi \in A^*, a \in A, x \in X.$$

Let $\text{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X) \subset \text{Fun}(A^* \times X)$ denote the subspace of all quasi-invariant functions. It is clear that a function f on $A^* \times X$ is quasi-invariant if and only if the function $\mathbb{1}_{\{\chi\}} \times f$ is quasi-invariant for every $\chi \in A^*$, which leads to a

decomposition of $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X)$ as a direct sum of the subspaces of quasi-invariant functions supported on the “slices” $\{\chi\} \times X$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that the space of quasi-invariant functions supported on $\{\chi\} \times X$ is naturally isomorphic to the space $\mathrm{Fun}(X)^{A, \chi}$. Thus, using the decomposition (4.1), we obtain a natural identification between the spaces $\mathrm{Fun}(X)$ and $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X)$.

Conversely, we will now exhibit an explicit isomorphism between $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X)$ and $\mathrm{Fun}(X)$, which will yield an alternate proof of the decomposition (4.1). Let us normalize the Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathrm{Fun}(A \times X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Fun}(A^* \times X), \quad f \mapsto \widehat{f}$$

as follows:

$$\widehat{f}(\chi, x) = \sum_{a \in A} \chi(a) \cdot f(a, x).$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{F}$ restricts to an isomorphism between the space $\mathrm{Fun}(A \times X)^A$ of functions $A \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that are invariant under the “antidiagonal” action of A , given by $a \cdot (b, x) = (ba^{-1}, ax)$, and the space $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X)$.

In turn, writing $\alpha : A \times X \rightarrow X$ for the action map, it is clear that the pullback α^* defines an isomorphism between $\mathrm{Fun}(X)$ and $\mathrm{Fun}(A \times X)^A$. Composing the two maps, we obtain an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{F} \circ \alpha^* : \mathrm{Fun}(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X);$$

explicitly, it is given by the formula

$$\mathrm{Fun}(X) \ni F \mapsto \widetilde{F} : (\chi, x) \mapsto \sum_{a \in A} \chi(a) F(ax).$$

The inverse isomorphism is also easy to calculate: it is the restriction of the map

$$\Pi_! : \mathrm{Fun}(A^* \times X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Fun}(X), \quad f \mapsto \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{\chi \in A^*} f(\chi, -),$$

to the subspace $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X) \subset \mathrm{Fun}(A^* \times X)$.

Using these observations, it is easy to see that for every $\chi \in A^*$, the map $\mathcal{F} \circ \alpha^*$ induces an isomorphism between $\mathrm{Fun}(X)^{A, \chi}$ and the subspace of $\mathrm{Fun}_{q.i.}(A^* \times X)$ consisting of functions that are supported on $\{\chi\} \times X$, which implies (4.1).

4.3. Quasi-equivariant complexes. For the remainder of the section we return to the setup described in §1.1. In particular, k is an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and ℓ is a prime different from p . Let A be a connected commutative perfect unipotent group over k , let A^* be the Serre dual of A , let X be a perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k , and suppose we are given a regular action of A on X . In what follows, to save space, we will write $\times$ in place of $\times_k$.

Our next goal is to construct a diagram of equivalences of categories

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_A(A \times X) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X) \\ & \nwarrow \sim & \nearrow \sim \\ & \mathcal{D}(X) & \end{array}$$

where A acts on $A \times X$ “antidiagonally,” via $a \cdot (b, x) = (ba^{-1}, ax)$, and $\mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$ is a certain category of “quasi-equivariant” complexes $A^* \times X$.

First we will define the latter category. Let $\mathcal{E}$ denote the universal local system on $A^* \times A$, and let $\mathcal{E}_X$ denote the pullback of $\mathcal{E}$ to the product $A^* \times A \times X$.

Remark 4.1. Observe that the order of the factors A and A^* has been reversed (cf. Proposition 3.3). This is done purely for notational convenience.

Let $\alpha : A \times X \rightarrow X$ denote the action morphism, let $\iota : A \rightarrow A$ denote the inversion map, $a \mapsto a^{-1}$, and let $\text{pr}' : A^* \times A \rightarrow A^*$ denote the projection onto the first factor. We obtain two morphisms:

$$\text{id}_{A^*} \times (\alpha \circ (\iota \times \text{id}_X)), \text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X : A^* \times A \times X \rightarrow A^* \times X.$$

Let us say that an object $M \in \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X)$ is *quasi-equivariant*⁸ if

$$(\text{id}_{A^*} \times (\alpha \circ (\iota \times \text{id}_X)))^* M \cong \mathcal{E}_X \otimes (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)^* M.$$

It is clear that this notion is the geometric counterpart of the notion of a quasi-invariant function used in §4.2 above. We let

$$\mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X)$$

denote the full subcategory formed by quasi-equivariant complexes.

4.4. Fourier-Deligne transform. Let $d = \dim A$, and let $\text{pr} : A^* \times A \rightarrow A$ denote the second projection (the first projection is denoted by pr' , as above). In §3.4 we recalled the definition of the Fourier-Deligne transform

$$\mathcal{F}_X : \mathcal{D}(A \times X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X),$$

namely,

$$\mathcal{F}_X(M) = (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)_! (\mathcal{E}_X \otimes (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_X)^* M)[d]. \quad (4.2)$$

In §3.5(1) we recalled that $\mathcal{F}_X$ is an equivalence of categories, with a quasi-inverse given by the formula

$$N \mapsto ((\iota \times \text{id}_X)^* \mathcal{F}'_X(N))(d),$$

where $\iota : A \rightarrow A$ is the inversion map, as above; (d) denotes the d -th Tate twist, and $\mathcal{F}'_X$ is also a Fourier-Deligne transform, given by the formula

$$\mathcal{F}'_X(N) = (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_X)_! (\mathcal{E}_X \otimes (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)^* N)[d]. \quad (4.3)$$

⁸The connectedness of A allows us to formulate quasi-equivariance as a *property*.

4.5. Geometric Fourier decomposition. The main goal of this section is the following result, which we call the *geometric Fourier decomposition theorem*.

Theorem 4.2. *Let the notation be as in §§4.3–4.4, and let $\Pi : A^* \times X \longrightarrow X$ denote the second projection. Then:*

(a) *The functor $\Pi_!$ restricts to an equivalence of categories*

$$\Pi_! : \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(X). \quad (4.4)$$

(b) *A quasi-inverse to the equivalence (4.4) is given by the formula*

$$M \longmapsto \mathcal{F}_X(\alpha^* M)d.$$

(c) *For every object $N \in \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$, the natural morphism $\Pi_! N \longrightarrow \Pi_* N$ is an isomorphism.*

(d) *The functor $\Pi_!$ induces an equivalence between the full subcategory of objects of $\mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$ that are perverse as complexes on $A^* \times X$ and the category of perverse sheaves on X .*

The proof is given in §4.6 below. In preparation for the proof, we first establish

Lemma 4.3. *The functor $\mathcal{F}_X$ induces an equivalence between the subcategories*

$$\mathcal{D}_A(A \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A \times X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X),$$

where $\mathcal{D}_A(A \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A \times X)$ is the full subcategory of equivariant complexes with respect to the antidiagonal action of A on $A \times X$.

Proof. In view of the formula for the quasi-inverse to the functor $\mathcal{F}_X$ given in §4.4, we must prove the following two statements.

- (1) If $N \in \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X)$ is quasi-equivariant, then the complex $(\iota \times \text{id}_X)^* \mathcal{F}'_X(N)$ is equivariant with respect to the antidiagonal action of A on $A \times X$.
- (2) If $M \in \mathcal{D}(A \times X)$ is equivariant with respect to the antidiagonal action of A on $A \times X$, then $\mathcal{F}_X(M)$ is a quasi-equivariant complex on $A^* \times X$.

To simplify notation, let us write $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha \circ (\iota \times \text{id}_X) : A \times X \longrightarrow X$.

Let $N \in \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X)$ be quasi-equivariant. By definition, this means that

$$\mathcal{E}_X \otimes (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)^* N \cong (\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* N.$$

The following diagram is clearly cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^* \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha}} & A^* \times X \\ \text{pr} \times \text{id}_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \Pi \\ A \times X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\alpha}} & X \end{array} \quad (4.5)$$

By the proper base change theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\iota \times \text{id}_X)^* \mathcal{F}'_X(N) &\cong (\iota \times \text{id}_X)^*(\text{pr} \times \text{id}_X)_!(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* N[d] \\ &\cong (\iota \times \text{id}_X)^* \tilde{\alpha}^* \Pi_! N[d] \\ &\cong \alpha^* \Pi_! N[d], \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

which is clearly A -equivariant, since the morphism α is A -invariant.

Conversely, let $M \in \mathcal{D}(A \times X)$ be equivariant with respect to the antidiagonal action of A . Since the A -action on $A \times X$ is free and α is the quotient morphism for this action, we have $M \cong \alpha^* K$ for some $K \in \mathcal{D}(X)$. It follows that

$$(\text{pr} \times \text{id}_X)^* M \cong (\text{pr} \times \text{id}_X)^* \alpha^* K \cong (\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K.$$

Let us write

$$L = \mathcal{E}_X \otimes ((\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K).$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}_X M[-d] = (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)_! L$ is quasi-equivariant; in other words, we need to prove that

$$(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha})^*(\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)_! L \cong \mathcal{E}_X \otimes ((\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)^*(\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)_! L). \quad (4.7)$$

To this end, consider the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^* \times A \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha}} & A^* \times A \times X \\ \text{pr}' \times \text{id}_{A \times X} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X \\ A^* \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha}} & A^* \times X \end{array}$$

The proper base change theorem implies that

$$(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{\alpha})^*(\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_X)_! L \cong (\text{pr}' \times \text{id}_{A \times X})_!(\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* L.$$

Let $\mathcal{E}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{13}$ denote the complexes on $A^* \times A \times A \times X$ obtained from $\mathcal{E}$ by pulling back along the projection $A^* \times A \times A \times X \rightarrow A^* \times A$ onto the first two factors (respectively, onto the first and the third factors). Then we have

$$(\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* L \cong \mathcal{E}_{12} \otimes ((\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^*(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K). \quad (4.8)$$

Next, let us write $\tilde{m} : A \times A \rightarrow A$ for the morphism given by $(a, b) \mapsto ab^{-1}$. The following square clearly commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^* \times A \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha}} & A^* \times A \times X \\ \text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \text{id}_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha \\ A^* \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha} & A^* \times X \end{array}$$

Hence

$$(\text{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^*(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K \cong (\text{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \text{id}_X)^*(\text{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K.$$

On the other hand, the bimultiplicative property of $\mathcal{E}$ implies that

$$(\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* \mathcal{E}_X \cong \mathcal{E}_{12} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{13}^{-1}.$$

Therefore (4.8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* L &\cong \mathcal{E}_{12} \otimes ((\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K) \\ &\cong \mathcal{E}_{13} \otimes (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* (\mathcal{E}_X \otimes (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \alpha)^* \Pi^* K) \\ &\cong \mathcal{E}_{13} \otimes (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* L. \end{aligned}$$

The following diagram is also cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^* \times A \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X} & A^* \times A \times X \\ \mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_{A \times X} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_X \\ A^* \times A \times X & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_X} & A^* \times X \end{array}$$

Moreover, we have $\mathcal{E}_{13} \cong (\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* \mathcal{E}_X$. By the projection formula,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_{A \times X})_! (\mathrm{id}_{A^* \times A} \times \tilde{\alpha})^* L &\cong (\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_{A \times X})_! (\mathcal{E}_{13} \otimes (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* L) \\ &\cong \mathcal{E}_X \otimes ((\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_{A \times X})_! (\mathrm{id}_{A^*} \times \tilde{m} \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* L) \\ &\cong \mathcal{E}_X \otimes ((\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* (\mathrm{pr}' \times \mathrm{id}_X)_! L), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the proper base change theorem at the last step. This yields (4.7), and the proof of the lemma is complete. $\square$

4.6. Proof of Theorem 4.2. Isomorphisms (4.6) can be chosen functorially with respect to $N \in \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$. Moreover, the functor α^* induces an equivalence between $\mathcal{D}(X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_A(A \times X)$. By Lemma 4.3 and the facts recalled in §4.4, the functor $\mathcal{F}_X$ induces an equivalence between $\mathcal{D}_A(A \times X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$, with quasi-inverse given by $(\iota \times \mathrm{id}_X)^* \mathcal{F}'_X(d)$. Parts (a) and (b) of Theorem 4.2 follow immediately from these remarks and the isomorphisms (4.6).

Part (d) follows from (c) via a standard argument based on a theorem of M. Artin, because the morphism Π is affine. Thus it remains to prove statement (c).

Let $\mathcal{F}'_{X*} : \mathcal{D}(A^* \times X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(A \times X)$ be defined by the same formula, (4.3), as $\mathcal{F}'_X$, but with $(\mathrm{pr} \times \mathrm{id}_X)_!$ replaced by $(\mathrm{pr} \times \mathrm{id}_X)_*$. We obtain a morphism of functors $\mathcal{F}'_X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_{X*}$, which is known to be an isomorphism (cf. §3.5(2)).

All morphisms in diagram (4.5) are smooth, so we can apply the smooth base change theorem to it. Given a complex $N \in \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$, we obtain a chain of functorial isomorphisms similar to (4.6), but with $\mathcal{F}'_X$ replaced by $\mathcal{F}'_{X*}$, and with the subscript “!” replaced by “*”. It follows that for every $N \in \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A^* \times X)$, the natural morphism $\alpha^* \Pi_! N \rightarrow \alpha^* \Pi_* N$ is an isomorphism. Since the functor α^* is fully faithful, this completes the proof of the theorem.

5. REDUCTION PROCESS FOR EQUIVARIANT COMPLEXES

5.1. Organization. In this section we develop a reduction process for equivariant complexes on a (possibly disconnected) unipotent group over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic. This process is analogous to the purely algebraic reduction process for representations of finite nilpotent groups described in one of the appendices to [BD06], as well as to the “geometric reduction process” for representations of finite groups of the form $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where G is a unipotent group over $\mathbb{F}_q$, introduced in [Bo07, §5].

The main result of the section is Theorem 5.3. Its proof is contained in §§5.6–5.7; it mimics the proof of [Bo07, Thm. 5.1], and is based on two auxiliary results, Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.6, which are proved in §A.1 and §5.8, respectively. We remark that the assumption that the base field is algebraically closed is only essential in Proposition 5.4; on the other hand, all other auxiliary results can be trivially reduced to the case where the base field is algebraically closed, so, as usual (cf. Remark 1.1) we only consider this case from the very beginning.

5.2. Compatibility. We remain in the setup of §1.1. The notion of an admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ for a perfect unipotent group G over k , where H is a connected subgroup of G and $\mathcal{L}$ is a multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system on G , was introduced in §1.7.

Definition 5.1. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, let $(H, \mathcal{L})$ be an admissible pair for G , and let G' be the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G (defined in §1.7). We say that the pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is *compatible with M* if $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M \neq 0$, where $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ denotes the extension of $\mathcal{L}$ to all of G by zero outside of H .

Remark 5.2. In this setting, one can show that the convolution $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M$ is automatically supported on G' (we postpone the proof until Example 6.1, which is independent of the results of this section). Thus the condition $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M \neq 0$ in the definition above is equivalent to $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * (M|_{G'}) \neq 0$. This comment will be used in the proofs below.

5.3. Main result. The remainder of this section is devoted to the proof of

Theorem 5.3. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $M \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, and let $(A, \mathcal{N})$ be a pair consisting of a normal connected subgroup $A \subset G$ and a G -invariant multiplicative $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -local system $\mathcal{N}$ on A such that $\overline{\mathcal{N}} * M \neq 0$, where $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$ is the extension of $\mathcal{N}$ to all of G by zero outside of A .*

Then there exists an admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ for G with the following properties:

- (i) *the pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is compatible with M ;*
- (ii) *we have $A \subset H$ and $\mathcal{L}|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$;*
- (iii) *if G' is the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G , then either $G' = G$, or there exists a closed connected subgroup $B \subset H$ such that B is normal in G and $\mathcal{L}|_B$ is not invariant under the conjugation action of G .*

5.4. A remark on notation. In what follows, we will encounter many situations where we start with a local system $\mathcal{L}$ on a closed subgroup H of a (quasi-)algebraic group G , and we wish to extend $\mathcal{L}$ by zero either to all of G or to an intermediate closed subgroup K , where $H \subset K \subset G$. In all such situations, the extension will be denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$. Writing out the precise interpretation of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ every time would render the text unreadable, so from now on we will use the notation $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ without further comment. We believe that this will cause no confusion, because in every situation, it will be easy to infer what the subgroup to which $\mathcal{L}$ is being extended is, from the context in which the notation $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ appears (in almost all cases, $K = G$).

5.5. Strategy of the proof. The argument that we will use to prove Theorem 5.3 is modeled on the proof of [Bo07, Thm. 5.1]. As in *loc. cit.*, we will use simultaneous induction on the dimension of G and the order of the group $\pi_0(G) = G/G^\circ$. The base of the induction will be the case where $[G, G^\circ] \subset A$, treated in §5.6. The induction step is presented in §5.7. First, however, we will state two auxiliary results, whose proofs are given later, because they would disturb the flow of §§5.6–5.7.

The following fact is proved in §A.1. Its analogue in the context of characters of unipotent groups over finite fields was used in [Bo07, §§5.5–5.6]; however, it was not formulated there as a separate result.

Proposition 5.4. *Let the hypotheses of Theorem 5.3 be satisfied, and let A_1 be a normal connected subgroup of G such that $[A_1, A_1] \subset A \subset A_1$. If the pullback of $\mathcal{N}$ by the commutator morphism $A_1 \times A_1 \rightarrow A$ is trivial, then there exists a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{N}_1$ on A_1 such that $\mathcal{N}_1|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M \neq 0$.*

Remark 5.5. As a special case, let M be the unit object of $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ (i.e., the delta-sheaf at the identity $1 \in G(k)$). Then the property $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M \neq 0$ always holds, and Proposition 5.4 amounts to the extension result [Bo07, Prop. 5.7]. Next, as an opposite extreme, suppose instead that A_1 is commutative and A is trivial. In this case it is easy to deduce the assertion of Proposition 5.4 from the fact that the Fourier-Deligne transform for A_1 is a faithful functor. The problem is to combine these two cases; this is accomplished in §A.1.

The next lemma has a purely algebraic analogue, explained in §5.8, which was *not* used in the reduction processes introduced in [BD06, Bo07]. The reason is that if χ is the character of a nonzero finite dimensional complex representation of a finite group Γ and $H \subset \Gamma$ is any subgroup, then the restriction $\chi|_H$ is necessarily a nonzero function on H . Of course, if χ is an arbitrary class function on Γ , the same statement may be false, but if one only performs various constructions that can be phrased in terms of representations, one can avoid working with more general class functions altogether. On the other hand, in the course of proving Theorem 5.3, it will be important for us to know that the restrictions of certain equivariant complexes to certain subgroups, obtained at the intermediate steps of the argument, are nonzero. This is where the following result (proved in §5.8) will be applied.

Lemma 5.6. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $A \subset G$ be a normal connected subgroup, let $\mathcal{L}$ be a multiplicative local system on A (possibly not G -invariant), and let $M \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ be a complex that is equivariant under the conjugation action of A . Then the convolution $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M$ is supported on the normalizer⁹ of $\mathcal{L}$ in G .*

Armed with Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.6, we will now prove Theorem 5.3.

5.6. A special case of Theorem 5.3. In this subsection we prove Theorem 5.3 under the assumption that $[G, G^\circ] \subset A$. If this containment holds, then $\mathcal{N}$ induces a homomorphism of perfect unipotent k -groups $\varphi_{\mathcal{N}} : (G/A) \rightarrow (G^\circ/A)^*$ via the construction recalled in §3.3. Let $H \subset G$ be a maximal (with respect to inclusion) connected subgroup such that $A \subset H$ and the composition

$$(H/A) \hookrightarrow (G/A) \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathcal{N}}} (G^\circ/A)^* \twoheadrightarrow (H/A)^*$$

is trivial. By the definition of $\varphi_{\mathcal{N}}$, this implies that the pullback of $\mathcal{N}$ by the commutator map $H \times H \rightarrow A$ is trivial. Since $[G, H] \subset [G, G^\circ] \subset A \subset H$, we see that H is normal in G . Applying Proposition 5.4 to $A_1 = H$, we see that there exists a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{L}$ on H such that $\mathcal{L}|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M \neq 0$.

Let us prove that the pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is admissible for G . Since H is normal in G , the third condition in the definition of admissibility is automatic. The first condition holds because $H \supset A$ and G°/A is central in G/A . Finally, the second condition holds by the maximality requirement in the choice of H .

Requirements (i) and (ii) stated in Theorem 5.3 are satisfied by construction. To see that (iii) is satisfied as well, we observe that if $G' = G$, then there is nothing to prove, and if $G' \neq G$, then we can take $B = H$ (because H is normal in G).

5.7. Proof of Theorem 5.3. Let us complete the proof of Theorem 5.3 in general. Enlarging A if necessary, we may assume that the pair $(A, \mathcal{N})$ is maximal among the ones satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.3, with respect to the obvious ordering: $(A, \mathcal{N}) \leq (A', \mathcal{N}') \iff A \subset A'$ and $\mathcal{N}'|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$. By the result of §5.6, we also may assume that $A \not\subset [G, G^\circ]$. Let $Z \subset G^\circ$ denote the preimage in G of the neutral component of the center of G/A . By assumption, $Z \neq G^\circ$, so Z is a proper connected subgroup of G° . As in §5.6, $\mathcal{N}$ induces a k -group morphism $\phi_{\mathcal{N}} : (G/A)_{\text{perf}} \rightarrow (Z/A)_{\text{perf}}^*$. Since $\dim Z < \dim G$, the restriction of this morphism to $(Z/A)_{\text{perf}}$ has positive dimensional kernel (cf. [Bo07, §5.6]). Thus there is a connected subgroup $A_1 \subset Z$ such that $A \subsetneq A_1$ and the composition

$$(A_1/A)_{\text{perf}} \hookrightarrow (G/A)_{\text{perf}} \xrightarrow{\phi_{\mathcal{N}}} (Z/A)_{\text{perf}}^* \twoheadrightarrow (A_1/A)_{\text{perf}}^*$$

is trivial. By the definition of $\phi_{\mathcal{N}}$, the pullback of $\mathcal{N}$ by the commutator morphism $A_1 \times A_1 \rightarrow A$ is trivial. Applying Proposition 5.4, we see that there exists a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{N}_1$ on A_1 such that $\mathcal{N}_1|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M \neq 0$.

⁹It is equal to the normalizer of the pair $(A, \mathcal{L})$, and hence can be defined as in §1.7.

Since $A \subset A_1 \subset Z$, we see that A_1 is a normal connected subgroup of G . Thus $\mathcal{N}_1$ is not G -invariant by the maximality requirement in the choice of $(A, \mathcal{N})$. Let G_1 denote the normalizer of $\mathcal{N}_1$ in G . By Lemma 5.6, the convolution $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M$ is supported on G_1 ; thus, $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M$ is the extension by zero of a nonzero object $M_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$. Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M_1 \neq 0$, because it is isomorphic to a shift of M_1 .

Therefore the hypotheses of Theorem 5.3 hold for the complex M_1 on the group G_1 and the pair $(A_1, \mathcal{N}_1)$. Since $G_1 \subsetneq G$, we may assume, by induction, that Theorem 5.3 holds in this case. Let $(H, \mathcal{L})$ satisfy the conclusion of the theorem for the quadruple $(G_1, M_1, A_1, \mathcal{N}_1)$. We claim that $(H, \mathcal{L})$ also satisfies the conclusion of the theorem for the quadruple $(G, M, A, \mathcal{N})$, which will complete the proof.

Let G' denote the normalizer of the pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G . It is clear that $G' \subset G_1$. Indeed, if $g \in G(k)$, $g \notin G_1(k)$, then g does not normalize $\mathcal{N}_1$, and hence, *a fortiori*, it cannot normalize the pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$, because A_1 is normal in G and $\mathcal{L}|_{A_1} \cong \mathcal{N}_1$.

Since $G' \subset G_1$, we see that the first two conditions in the definition of admissibility for $(H, \mathcal{L})$ hold with respect to G because they hold with respect to G_1 . To verify the third condition, let $g \in G(k)$, $g \notin G'(k)$. If $g \in G_1(k)$, there is nothing to check because $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is admissible for G_1 . If $g \notin G_1(k)$, then, since $A_1 \subset (H \cap H^g)^\circ$ and g does not normalize $\mathcal{N}_1$, it follows that the restrictions of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^g$ to $(H \cap H^g)^\circ$ cannot be isomorphic, proving that $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is admissible for G .

It is obvious that requirements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 5.3 are satisfied, since

$$0 \neq \overline{\mathcal{L}} * M_1 = (\overline{\mathcal{L}} * \overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M)|_{G_1} \cong ((\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) * \overline{\mathcal{N}}_1)|_{G_1}.$$

Requirement (iii) is satisfied by taking $B = A_1$, which completes the proof.

5.8. Proof of Lemma 5.6. As a motivation for Lemma 5.6 and its proof, we first mention its purely algebraic analogue. Let Γ be a finite group, let $N \subset \Gamma$ be a normal subgroup, and let $\chi : N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ be a (not necessarily Γ -invariant) homomorphism.

Let Γ_χ denote the normalizer of χ in Γ , and let $\overline{\chi} : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ denote the function obtained via extending χ by zero outside of H . We claim that if $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function that is invariant under conjugation by N , then the convolution $\overline{\chi} * f$ is supported on Γ_χ .

To see this, let us write $f_1 = \overline{\chi} * f$. Then f_1 is invariant under the conjugation action of N , because both $\overline{\chi}$ and f are. In addition, we clearly have $f_1(n g) = \chi(n) f_1(g)$ for all $g \in \Gamma$ and all $n \in N$. Now let $g_0 \in \Gamma$ lie outside of Γ_χ . Then there exists $n \in N$ with $\chi(g_0 n g_0^{-1}) \neq \chi(n)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(n) f_1(g_0) &= f_1(n g_0) = f_1(n (g_0 n) n^{-1}) = f_1(g_0 n) \\ &= f_1((g_0 n g_0^{-1}) g_0) = \chi(g_0 n g_0^{-1}) f_1(g_0), \end{aligned}$$

which forces $f_1(g_0) = 0$, as claimed.

The proof of Lemma 5.6 will be somewhat similar to the purely algebraic argument we presented: we will show that if $g_0 \in G(k)$ does not normalize $\mathcal{L}$, then the restriction of $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M$ to the coset $g_0A = Ag_0$ is equal to zero. The proof of this claim will be based on the following two sublemmas.

Sublemma 5.7. *In the situation of Lemma 5.6, fix $g_0 \in G(k)$, and consider the morphisms $\alpha, \beta : A \longrightarrow G$ defined by $\alpha(a) = ag_0$, $\beta(a) = g_0a$. Then $\alpha^*M \cong \beta^*M$.*

Proof. Let $c : A \times G \longrightarrow G$ denote the conjugation action map, $c(a, g) = aga^{-1}$, and let $p_2 : A \times G \longrightarrow G$ denote the second projection. Then $c^*M \cong p_2^*M$ by assumption. On the other hand, if $\gamma : A \longrightarrow A \times G$ is defined by $\gamma(a) = (a, g_0a)$, then $c \circ \gamma = \alpha$ and $p_2 \circ \gamma = \beta$, which implies the assertion of the sublemma. $\square$

The next result is essentially [Bo07, Lem. 6.6.], except that it is stated in *op. cit.* with an unnecessary extra assumption (which was not used in the proof).

Sublemma 5.8. *Let A be a connected perfect unipotent group over k , and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a multiplicative local system¹⁰ on A . If $N \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, then $\mathcal{L} * N \cong (\mathcal{L} * N)_1 \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell} \mathcal{L}$, where $(\mathcal{L} * N)_1$ is the stalk of $\mathcal{L} * N$ at the identity element $1 \in A(k)$.*

Note that the stalk $(\mathcal{L} * N)_1$ is merely a bounded complex of finite dimensional $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ -vector spaces, because k is algebraically closed. Thus the content of the sublemma is essentially that the convolution $\mathcal{L} * N$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of various cohomological shifts of $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof of Sublemma 5.8. Let $\mu : A \times A$ denote the multiplication morphism. We first calculate the pullback $\mu^*(\mathcal{L} * N)$. The following diagram is clearly cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times A \times A & \xrightarrow{\mu \times \text{id}} & A \times A \\ \text{id} \times \mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \end{array}$$

The definition of convolution and the proper base change theorem imply that

$$\mu^*(\mathcal{L} * N) \cong \mu^*\mu_!(\mathcal{L} \boxtimes N) \cong (\text{id} \times \mu_!)((\mu^*\mathcal{L}) \boxtimes N).$$

Since $\mathcal{L}$ is multiplicative, we have $\mu^*\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L} \boxtimes \mathcal{L}$, whence $\mu^*(\mathcal{L} * N) \cong \mathcal{L} \boxtimes (\mathcal{L} * N)$.

On the other hand, writing $1 : \text{Spec } k \longrightarrow A$ for the morphism defining the identity element of A , we obtain a morphism $(\text{id}_A \times 1) : A \longrightarrow A \times A$, and, by definition, $\mu \circ (\text{id}_A \times 1) = \text{id}_A$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{L} * N \cong (\text{id}_A \times 1)^*\mu^*(\mathcal{L} * N) \cong (\text{id}_A \times 1)^*(\mathcal{L} \boxtimes (\mathcal{L} * N)) \cong (\mathcal{L} * N)_1 \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell} \mathcal{L},$$

which completes the proof of the sublemma. $\square$

¹⁰The ambient group G does not enter the formulation of this sublemma.

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Fix a point $g_0 \in G(k)$ that does not normalize $\mathcal{L}$. In other words, if $\mathcal{L}^{g_0}$ denotes the pullback of $\mathcal{L}$ by the map $a \mapsto g_0 a g_0^{-1}$, then $\mathcal{L}^{g_0} \not\cong \mathcal{L}$.

Let the morphisms α and β be defined as in Sublemma 5.7. It suffices to show that $\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) = 0$. The following diagram is clearly cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times G & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G \\ \alpha' \uparrow & & \uparrow \alpha \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \end{array}$$

where μ and μ' are the multiplication morphisms and $\alpha'(a, b) = (a, b g_0)$. By definition, $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M \cong \mu'_!(\mathcal{L} \boxtimes M)$, whence, by the proper base change theorem,

$$\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) \cong \mu_! \alpha'^*(\mathcal{L} \boxtimes M) \cong \mu_!(\mathcal{L} \boxtimes \rho^* M) \cong \mathcal{L} * (\rho^* M),$$

where $\rho : A \rightarrow G$ is given by $\rho(b) = b g_0$. Using Sublemma 5.8, we obtain

$$\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) \cong (\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M))_1 \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell} \mathcal{L}. \quad (5.1)$$

Next, let us consider the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times G & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G \\ \beta' \uparrow & & \uparrow \beta \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \end{array}$$

where μ and μ' are as above and $\beta'(a, b) = (g_0 a g_0^{-1}, g_0 b)$. An argument similar to the one we just presented yields $\beta^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) \cong \mathcal{L}^{g_0} * (\lambda^* M)$, where $\lambda : A \rightarrow G$ is given by $\lambda(b) = g_0 b$. Using Sublemma 5.8, we obtain

$$\beta^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) \cong (\beta^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M))_1 \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell} \mathcal{L}^{g_0}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ and M are equivariant with respect to the conjugation action of A on G , so is $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M$, whence we can apply Sublemma 5.7 to $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M$ in place of M . We see that $\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) \cong \beta^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M)$. In view of (5.1)–(5.2) and the assumption that $\mathcal{L}^{g_0} \not\cong \mathcal{L}$, we see that $\alpha^*(\overline{\mathcal{L}} * M) = 0$, as desired. $\square$

6. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Throughout this section, k denotes an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$, and ℓ denotes a prime different from p .

6.1. Auxiliary constructions. Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , and let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup. The induction functors

$$\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G : \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$$

were defined in §1.9. The functor $\mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G$ is right adjoint to the restriction functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, and for every $M \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, we let

$$\eta_M : (\mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G M)|_{G'} \longrightarrow M$$

denote the adjunction morphism. Furthermore, by construction (see §1.9), for every $M \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, we have a canonical arrow

$$\mathrm{can}_M : \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G M \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ind}_{G'}^G M.$$

Next, let $e \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be a weak idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G (see Definition 1.29). As usual, we will write $\bar{e}$ for the object of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ obtained by extending e to all of G by zero outside of G' . It follows from [Bo07, Lem. 4.14] that for every $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, the convolution $\bar{e} * N$ is supported on G' . Thus $\bar{e} * N$ can be viewed as the extension of $e * (N|_{G'})$ by zero. In view of this fact, and in order to save space, we introduce the notation $e * N$ for $e * (N|_{G'})$, and we view $N \longmapsto e * N$ as a functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \longrightarrow e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$.

Example 6.1. Let us use this observation to justify the assertion made in Remark 5.2. Suppose that G' is the normalizer of an admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ for G (cf. §1.7), and let $e'_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be the Heisenberg minimal idempotent defined by $(H, \mathcal{L})$ (cf. §1.8). It is proved in [Bo07, §7.5] that $e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfies the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G (Def. 1.29). Hence, for every $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, the convolution $\bar{e}'_{\mathcal{L}} * N$ is supported on G' . However, $\bar{e}'_{\mathcal{L}} \cong \bar{\mathcal{L}}[2 \dim H]$, whence $\bar{\mathcal{L}} * N$ is also supported on G' .

Let us now summarize some of the results that were obtained in [Bo07, §4] in this setup. They will be used in the proofs of Propositions 6.6 and 6.7, stated below.

Lemma 6.2. *The object $f = \mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G e$ is a weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*

This follows from [Bo07, Prop. 4.9].

Lemma 6.3. *We have $\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G M \in f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ for every $M \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, and the functor*

$$\mathrm{ind}_{G'}^G \Big|_{e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')} : e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \longrightarrow f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \quad (6.1)$$

is a bijection at the level of isomorphism classes of objects. If e is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, then the functor (6.1) is also faithful.

This follows from [Bo07, Thm. 4.10(a)–(b)].

Lemma 6.4 (cf. Prop. 4.12 in [Bo07]). *For every $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, there exists an isomorphism $f * N \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{ind}_{G'}^G(e * N)$, functorial with respect to N .*

Lemma 6.5. *For every $M \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, the composition*

$$e * (\text{ind}_{G'}^G M) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_e * (\text{can}_M)|_{G'}} e * (\text{Ind}_{G'}^G M) \xrightarrow{\text{id}_e * \eta_M} e * M \quad (6.2)$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$.

To see this, one can verify by a straightforward inspection that the composition (6.2) coincides with the isomorphism between $e * (\text{ind}_{G'}^G M)$ and $e * M$ constructed in [Bo07, Prop. 4.13].

6.2. Preliminary results. Armed with the tools introduced in §6.1, we are now ready to state the key auxiliary propositions that will be used in the proofs of the main results of our work. They are proved in §6.7 and §A.4, respectively¹¹.

Proposition 6.6. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $G' \subset G$ be a closed subgroup, and let $e \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be a closed idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition (Def. 1.29). Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *For every $M \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G'}^G M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^G M$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*
- (ii) *The object $f = \text{ind}_{G'}^G e$ is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*

Proposition 6.7. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k , let $B \subset G$ be a closed connected normal subgroup, let $\mathcal{K}$ be a multiplicative local system on B , and let G'' denote the normalizer of $\mathcal{K}$ in G . Let $\mathcal{D}_{B,\mathcal{K},G''}(G'') \subset \mathcal{D}_{G''}(G'')$ denote the full subcategory consisting of equivariant complexes that transform according to $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to the action of B by left multiplication. For every $M \in \mathcal{D}_{B,\mathcal{K},G''}(G'')$, the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G''}^G M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G''}^G M$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*

6.3. The heart of the proof. We can now establish the following crucial fact, from which all the main results of our work (stated in §1) follow without difficulty.

Theorem 6.8. *Let G be a perfect unipotent group over k . Then*

- (a) *For any nonzero object $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, there exists a closed idempotent $f \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ that is minimal as a weak idempotent and satisfies $f * N \neq 0$.*
- (b) *Let $G_1 \subset G$ be a closed subgroup, and let $e_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$ be a minimal closed idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition (Def. 1.29). Then, for every $M \in e_1\mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$, the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G_1}^G M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G_1}^G M$ is an isomorphism.*

¹¹It is transparent that in the proofs of these propositions that we give, we only use the results that were proved up to §6.1. Therefore the use of the propositions in the other proofs appearing in the present section is justified (i.e., does not lead to a vicious cycle in the arguments).

Proof of Theorem 6.8. The argument uses simultaneous induction on the dimension $\dim G$ and the order of the finite discrete group $\pi_0(G) = G/G^\circ$. A noteworthy point is that the two statements of the theorem must be proved at once (i.e., if we were to separate the statement into two different ones, the induction argument we will present would not have gone through).

For part (a), we apply Theorem 5.3 to the object $N \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ and to the trivial pair $(A, \mathcal{N})$. We deduce the existence of an admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ for G such that $\overline{\mathcal{L}} * N \neq 0$ and one of the following two possibilities is realized.

Case 1. $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is invariant under the conjugation action of G .

Case 2. There exists a connected subgroup $B \subset H$ such that B is normal in G and the restriction $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{L}|_B$ is *not* invariant under the conjugation action of G .

Let G' denote the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G (see §1.7), let $e'_\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ denote the Heisenberg minimal idempotent defined by $(H, \mathcal{L})$ (see §1.8), and recall from Example 6.1 that $\overline{e}_\mathcal{L} \cong \overline{\mathcal{L}}[2 \dim H]$. In Case 1, we have $G' = G$, and it follows from Lemma 1.21 that $f := e'_\mathcal{L}$ is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, which is minimal as a weak idempotent. Moreover, $f * N \neq 0$ by construction.

In Case 2, put $f = \text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_\mathcal{L}$. It is shown in [Bo07, §7.5] that $e'_\mathcal{L}$ satisfies the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G . By Lemma 6.2, f is a minimal weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. Moreover, $e'_\mathcal{L} * N \neq 0$ by construction, and combining Lemma 6.3 and 6.4, we deduce that $f * N \neq 0$. Hence, if we prove that f is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, the (induction step in the) proof of part (a) of the theorem will be complete. For that, by Proposition 6.6, it suffices to establish the following

CLAIM. *For every $M \in e'_\mathcal{L} \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G'}^G M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^G M$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$.*

To this end, let G'' denote the normalizer of $\mathcal{K}$ (which is the same as the normalizer of the pair $(B, \mathcal{K})$) in G . We clearly have a diagram of inclusions

$$B \subset H \subset G' \subset G'' \subset G.$$

Moreover, we have natural decompositions

$$\text{ind}_{G'}^G \cong \text{ind}_{G''}^G \circ \text{ind}_{G'}^{G''} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{G'}^G \cong \text{Ind}_{G''}^G \circ \text{Ind}_{G'}^{G''}. \quad (6.3)$$

By construction, $G'' \subsetneq G$, and hence, by induction, we may assume that both parts of Theorem 6.8 hold for the group G'' in place of G . We will now use these observations to finish the proof of the claim above.

Since $G' \subset G''$, it is clear that $(H, \mathcal{L})$ is an admissible pair for G . Moreover, G' is also the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G'' , and $e'_\mathcal{L}$ also satisfies the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G'' . Applying part (b) of the theorem to G'' in place of G , we see that the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G'}^{G''} M \longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^{G''} M$ is an isomorphism for every $M \in e'_\mathcal{L} \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if $M \in e'_\mathcal{L} \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, then

$\text{ind}_{G'}^{G''} M \in \mathcal{D}_{B, \mathcal{K}, G''}(G'')$, where we are using the notation of Proposition 6.7. By that proposition, the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G'}^G M' \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^G M'$ is an isomorphism for every $M' \in \mathcal{D}_{B, \mathcal{K}, G''}(G'')$. In view of the decompositions (6.3) (which are compatible with the canonical arrows $\text{ind}_{G'}^{G''} \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^{G''}$, $\text{ind}_{G''}^G \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{G''}^G$ and $\text{ind}_{G'}^G \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{G'}^G$ in the obvious sense), we arrive at the italicized claim above.

It remains to prove part (b) of Theorem 6.8. In view of the argument above, we may assume that part (a) of the theorem holds for the group G and for all “smaller” perfect unipotent groups. Let $G_1 \subset G$ be an arbitrary closed subgroup, and let $e_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$ be a minimal closed idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G . Applying part (a) to G_1 , we deduce the existence of a closed idempotent $f_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$ that is minimal as a weak idempotent and satisfies $e_1 * f_1 \neq 0$. Then, *a fortiori*, f_1 is minimal as a closed idempotent as well, so that $e_1 \cong e_1 * f_1 \cong f_1$. Hence we see that e_1 is also minimal as a weak idempotent.

Next, let $e = \text{ind}_{G_1}^G e_1$. By Lemma 6.2, e is a minimal weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. By an argument similar to the one given in the previous paragraph, e is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. Applying Proposition 6.6, we deduce that the canonical arrow $\text{ind}_{G_1}^G M \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{G_1}^G M$ is an isomorphism for every $M \in e_1 \mathcal{D}_{G_1}(G_1)$, which completes the induction step in the proof of Theorem 6.8. $\square$

6.4. Proof of Theorem 1.27. Part (c) of the theorem follows from Theorem 6.8(a).

To prove parts (a) and (b) simultaneously, let us consider an object $e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ that is *either* a minimal weak idempotent, *or* a minimal closed idempotent. By Theorem 6.8(a), there exists a closed idempotent $f \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$ that is minimal as a weak idempotent and satisfies $f * e \neq 0$. In either of the two possible cases, this implies that $e \cong f * e \cong f$, which finishes the proof.

6.5. Proof of Theorem 1.30. We use the notation introduced in the statement of the theorem. Thus G is a perfect unipotent group over k , $G' \subset G$ is a closed subgroup, $e \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ is a minimal closed idempotent satisfying the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G , and $f = \text{ind}_{G'}^G e \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$.

By Theorem 1.27(a), e is a minimal weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$. By [Bo07, Cor. 4.11], f is a minimal weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. By Theorem 1.27(b), f is also a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$. This implies Theorem 1.30(a).

To prove Theorem 1.30(b), recall from §6.1 (in particular, Lemma 6.3) that $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ restricts to a functor $e \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow f \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, and that we also have a functor in the opposite direction, which we denoted by $N \mapsto e * N$. By Lemmas 6.4 and 6.5, the compositions of these two functors (taken in two possible orders) are isomorphic to the functors $e \mapsto e * M$ on $e \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ and $N \mapsto f * N$ on $f \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, respectively.

We already established that e and f are closed idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ and $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, respectively. It follows from the definition of a closed idempotent that the functors $e \mapsto e * M$ on $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ and $N \mapsto f * N$ on $f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ are isomorphic to the identity functors on the respective categories. This proves Theorem 1.30(b).

Finally, Theorem 1.30(c) results directly from Theorem 6.8(b).

6.6. Proof of Theorems 1.13 and 1.26. It will be convenient to prove both results at once¹². In the situation of part (a) of Theorem 1.26, note that $\text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a minimal *weak* idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, which follows from [Bo07, Cor. 4.11]. By Theorem 1.27, which we already proved, $\text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a minimal *closed* idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ as well, which yields Theorem 1.26(a).

Next, let us fix a minimal closed idempotent $f \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$. Analyzing the proof of Theorem 6.8(a) given above, we see that there exists an admissible pair $(H, \mathcal{L})$ for G with the following property. Let G' be the normalizer of $(H, \mathcal{L})$ in G , and let $e'_{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ be the Heisenberg minimal idempotent corresponding to $(H, \mathcal{L})$ (cf. §1.8). Then $\text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a minimal closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, and $f * (\text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}) \neq 0$. By the definition of minimality, $f \cong \text{ind}_{G'}^G e'_{\mathcal{L}}$, which proves part (c) of Theorem 1.26.

Finally, let us prove Theorem 1.13 together with Theorem 1.26(b). From now on, for simplicity, we will write $e = e'_{\mathcal{L}}$, and replace e with f in the statement of Theorem 1.13 (for consistency). By Theorem 1.22, we know that Theorem 1.13 holds for the minimal closed idempotent $e = e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$. This forces $n_e = \dim H$, because $e[-\dim H] \cong \overline{\mathcal{L}}[\dim H]$ is a perverse sheaf on G' (as before, $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ is the extension of $\mathcal{L}$ to G' by zero outside of H). To complete the proof, we only need to show that the functor $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ takes $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$ to $\mathcal{M}_f^{\text{perv}}[-\dim(G/G')]$, because for all $M, N \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, there is a canonical isomorphism $(\text{ind}_{G'}^G M) * (\text{ind}_{G'}^G N) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{ind}_{G'}^G(M * N)$, which was constructed in [Bo07, §4.4.2] (see also Prop. 4.9 in *op. cit.*).

To this end, let us recall a result that is essentially due to M. Artin:

Theorem 6.9 ([BBD82], Thm. 4.1.1). *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an affine morphism of separated schemes of finite type over k , the functor $f_* : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$ is left exact with respect to the perverse t -structures, i.e., takes ${}^p\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(X)$ into ${}^p\mathcal{D}^{\leq 0}(Y)$.*

Corollary 6.10 (*op. cit.*, Cor. 4.1.2). *Under the same assumptions, the functor $f_! : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$ is t -right exact, i.e., takes ${}^p\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(X)$ into ${}^p\mathcal{D}^{\geq 0}(Y)$.*

We also recall

Proposition 6.11. *If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a smooth morphism of k -schemes everywhere of relative dimension d , then $f^*[d]$ takes $\text{Perv}(Y)$ into $\text{Perv}(X)$.*

¹²In particular, Theorems 1.26 and 1.22 together essentially contain Theorem 1.13. The main reason why we stated Theorem 1.13 separately is that we were able to give its formulation right after the definition of character sheaves, without being distracted by the more technical details of our exposition.

Analyzing the definitions of the functors $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ and $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G$ given in §1.9 and applying the three results quoted above, we conclude that $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ takes ${}^p\mathcal{D}_{G'}^{\geq 0}(G')$ into ${}^p\mathcal{D}_G^{\geq 0}(G)[- \dim(G/G')]$, whereas $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G$ takes ${}^p\mathcal{D}_{G'}^{\leq 0}(G')$ into ${}^p\mathcal{D}_G^{\leq 0}(G)[- \dim(G/G')]$. However, the restrictions of $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ and $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G$ to $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ are isomorphic by Theorem 1.30(c) (proved above), because $e = e'_{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfies the geometric Mackey condition with respect to G by the argument given in [Bo07, §7.5]. Thus $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ takes $\mathcal{M}_e^{\text{perv}}$ into $\mathcal{M}_f^{\text{perv}}[- \dim(G/G')]$, as asserted, which completes the proof.

6.7. Proof of Proposition 6.6. Let us assume (i), and show that (ii) follows. Note that f is a weak idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ by Lemma 6.2. To prove that f is in fact a closed idempotent, we will use Proposition 2.18.

Let I denote the following composition of functors:

$$e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \xrightarrow{\text{ind}_{G'}^G} f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G), \quad (6.4)$$

where the second arrow is the inclusion. Because property (i) in Proposition 6.6 is assumed to hold, (6.4) is isomorphic to the following composition:

$$e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \xrightarrow{\text{Ind}_{G'}^G} \mathcal{D}_G(G), \quad (6.5)$$

where the first arrow is the inclusion. The restriction functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ is left adjoint to $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G$, while the functor $M \mapsto e * M$ is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ by Proposition 2.18(a). It follows that the functor $N \mapsto e * N$ constructed in §6.1 is left adjoint to the composition (6.5).

Moreover, it follows from Lemma 6.5 (and assumption (i) of the proposition) that for every $M \in e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, the adjunction morphism $e * (\text{Ind}_{G'}^G M) \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism. By standard category theory, we now see that the composition (6.5) is a fully faithful functor. Therefore, so is the composition (6.4), and hence, *a fortiori*, the functor $\text{ind}_{G'}^G : e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ is an equivalence of categories.

The last observation, together with Lemma 6.4 and the fact that the functor $N \mapsto e * N$ is left adjoint to (6.5) (and therefore also to (6.4)), implies that the functor $N \mapsto f * N$ is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$. By Proposition 2.18(b), f is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, as desired.

Conversely, let us assume that property (ii) stated in Proposition 6.6 holds, and deduce property (i). First let us prove a weaker statement, namely, that the functors $\text{ind}_{G'}^G|_{e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')}$ and $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G|_{e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')}$ are isomorphic¹³. To this end, it suffices to show that they have isomorphic left adjoint functors. Now, because e and f are closed idempotents in $\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ and $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, respectively, it follows from Lemmas 6.4 and

¹³The idea of the argument we present below was borrowed from a proof of the result that Fourier-Deligne transform commutes with Verdier duality, which was explained to us by Dennis Gaitsgory and is reproduced in the appendix on the Fourier-Deligne transform in [BD06].

6.5 that $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ induces an equivalence of categories between $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ and $f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, where a quasi-inverse functor is the functor $N \mapsto e * N$ defined in §6.1.

A fortiori, the functor $f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \rightarrow e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ given by $N \mapsto e * N$ is left adjoint to the functor $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow f\mathcal{D}_G(G)$ induced by $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$. Furthermore, because of our assumption, by Proposition 2.18(a), the functor $N \mapsto f * N$ is left adjoint to the inclusion functor $f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$. Putting these two facts together, we see that the functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \rightarrow e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ given by $N \mapsto e * (f * N)$ is left adjoint to the functor $\text{ind}_{G'}^G : e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$.

On the other hand, by a similar argument, the functor $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \rightarrow e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ given by $N \mapsto e * N$ is left adjoint to the functor $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G : e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G') \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, since the latter is equal to the composition (6.5).

We now claim that the two functors $\mathcal{D}_G(G) \rightarrow e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$, given by $N \mapsto e * (f * N)$ and $N \mapsto e * N$, are isomorphic (which will imply that the compositions (6.4) and (6.5) are isomorphic). To this end, it suffices to prove that the two functors become isomorphic after we compose them with $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ (since we already established that the restriction of $\text{ind}_{G'}^G$ to $e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$ is fully faithful). However, by Lemma 6.4, the two compositions in questions are isomorphic to the functors $N \mapsto f * f * N$ and $N \mapsto f * N$, respectively, which are isomorphic because f is a closed idempotent in $\mathcal{D}_G(G)$, by the assumption we made.

So far, we have shown that there exists *some* isomorphism between the functors $\text{ind}_{G'}^G|_{e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')}$ and $\text{Ind}_{G'}^G|_{e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')}$. To deduce that the canonical morphism can be in fact an isomorphism, we argue as follows. We already know that the images of the two functors lie in the subcategory $f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \subset \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, and that the functor $N \mapsto e * N$ on this subcategory defines an equivalence $f\mathcal{D}_G(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} e\mathcal{D}_{G'}(G')$. Thus it suffices to show that the first arrow in (6.2) is an isomorphism. However, since the entire composition (6.2) is an isomorphism, we are reduced to the following simple observation: if $\mathcal{T}$ is a triangulated k -linear category, where k is a field and $\dim_k \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Y) < \infty$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$, then every arrow $X \xrightarrow{i} Y$ in $\mathcal{T}$ that has a left inverse, where $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$ are *isomorphic* objects, is in fact an isomorphism¹⁴.

APPENDIX

In this appendix we present certain straightforward generalizations of the results related to Serre duality and the Fourier-Deligne transform for commutative unipotent groups, formulated in the main body of the text, to the noncommutative setting. We use these generalizations to prove Propositions 5.4 and 6.7.

¹⁴To see this, note that for any object Z of $\mathcal{T}$, the induced map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y, Z) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, Z)$ is surjective, but because both spaces have the same (finite) dimension over k , the map must be an isomorphism, and Yoneda's lemma yields the desired result.

A.1. Proof of Proposition 5.4. Throughout the appendix we will write $\times$ in place of $\times_k$ to simplify the notation. Let A_1^* be the Serre dual of A_1 , and let $\mathcal{E}_1$ denote the universal local system on $A_1^* \times_k A_1$. The Fourier-Deligne transform

$$\mathcal{F}_X : \mathcal{D}(A_1 \times X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X),$$

where X is any perfect quasi-algebraic scheme over k , was defined in §3.4. The next lemma will be proved in §A.2.

Lemma A.1. *In the situation of Proposition 5.4, let $\mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X)$ denote the full subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(A_1 \times X)$ consisting of complexes N such that*

$$(\mu'' \times \text{id}_X)^* N \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes N \quad \text{on } A \times A_1 \times X,$$

where $\mu'' : A \times A_1 \longrightarrow A_1$ is the multiplication morphism. Further, let $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^* \subset A_1^*$ denote the fiber over $[\mathcal{N}]$ of the restriction map $A_1^* \longrightarrow A^*$. Then $\mathcal{F}_X$ restricts to an equivalence between $\mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X)$ and the full subcategory $\mathcal{D}(A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^* \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X)$ consisting of complexes that are supported on $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^* \times X$.

Remark A.2. By [Bo07, Prop. 5.7], $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^*$ is nonempty. It follows that $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^*$ is a coset of $(A_1/A)^*$ in A_1^* , where $(A_1/A)^*$ is identified with a subgroup of A_1^* by means of the map given by pullback via the projection $A_1 \longrightarrow A_1/A$.

Remark A.3. We observe that the ambient group G was not mentioned so far. In fact, we will see that Lemma A.1 reduces to a statement about the Fourier-Deligne transform in the *commutative* setting.

We will now prove Proposition 5.4 using Lemma A.1. Let us write $M_1 = \overline{\mathcal{N}} * M$. By assumption, $M_1 \neq 0$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathcal{D}_G(G)$, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{N}$ can be extended to a multiplicative local system $\mathcal{N}_1$ on A_1 such that $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_1 * M_1 \neq 0$.

Let $\mu' : A \times G \longrightarrow G$ and $\mu'_1 : A_1 \times G \longrightarrow G$ denote the multiplication morphisms. We first claim that $\mu'^* M_1 \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes M_1$. By construction, $M_1 = \mu'_1(\mathcal{N} \boxtimes M)$. Applying the proper base change theorem to the cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times G & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G \\ \mu \times \text{id}_G \uparrow & & \uparrow \mu' \\ A \times A \times G & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \times \mu'} & A \times G \end{array}$$

where μ is the multiplication in A , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'^* M_1 &\cong \mu'^* \mu'_1(\mathcal{N} \boxtimes M) \cong (\text{id}_A \times \mu')_!(\mu \times \text{id}_G)^*(\mathcal{N} \boxtimes M) \\ &\cong (\text{id}_A \times \mu')_!(\mathcal{N} \boxtimes \mathcal{N} \boxtimes M) \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes \mu'_1(\mathcal{N} \boxtimes M) \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes M_1, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Next, we will deduce that $\mu_1'^* M_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{A, \mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times G)$, with the notation of Lemma A.1. Indeed, the following diagram clearly commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & A \times G & \\
 \text{id}_A \times \mu_1' \nearrow & & \searrow \mu' \\
 A \times A_1 \times G & & G \\
 \mu'' \times \text{id}_G \searrow & & \nearrow \mu_1' \\
 & A_1 \times G &
 \end{array}$$

This implies that

$$(\mu'' \times \text{id}_G)^* \mu_1'^* M_1 \cong (\text{id}_A \times \mu_1')^* \mu'^* M_1 \cong (\text{id}_A \times \mu_1')^* (\mathcal{N} \boxtimes M_1) \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes (\mu_1'^* M_1),$$

as claimed.

Let us recall that $M_1 \neq 0$, so $\mu_1'^* M_1 \neq 0$. Applying Lemma A.1 to $X = G$, we see that $\mathcal{F}_G(\mu_1'^* M_1) \neq 0$. In particular, there exists¹⁵ $\mathcal{N}'_1 \in A_1^*(k)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_G(\mu_1'^* M_1)|_{\{\mathcal{N}'_1\} \times G} \neq 0$. The restriction $\mathcal{F}_G(\mu_1'^* M_1)|_{\{\mathcal{N}'_1\} \times G}$ can be calculated using the proper base change theorem. Namely, let us identify $\{\mathcal{N}'_1\} \times G$ with G in the obvious manner, and let $p : A_1 \times G \rightarrow G$ denote the second projection. Then the restriction of $\mathcal{E}_{1,G}$ to $\{\mathcal{N}'_1\} \times A_1 \times G$ is identified with $\mathcal{N}'_{1,G}$, the pullback of $\mathcal{N}'_1$ via the first projection $A_1 \times G \rightarrow A_1$. It follows from the proper base change theorem that

$$\mathcal{F}_G(\mu_1'^* M_1)|_{\{\mathcal{N}'_1\} \times G} \cong p_!(\mathcal{N}_{1,G}'' \otimes (\mu_1'^* M_1)).$$

Let us prove that $p_!(\mathcal{N}'_{1,G} \otimes (\mu_1'^* M_1)) \cong \overline{\mathcal{N}'_1}^{-1} * M_1$. To this end, consider the involution $\sigma : A_1 \times G \rightarrow A_1 \times G$ defined by $\sigma(a_1, g) = (a_1^{-1}, a_1 g)$. Then $p \circ \sigma = \mu_1'$ and $\mu_1' \circ \sigma = p$. The functors σ^* and $\sigma_!$ are quasi-inverse to each other, which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_!(\mathcal{N}'_{1,G} \otimes (\mu_1'^* M_1)) &\cong p_! \sigma_! \sigma^* (\mathcal{N}'_{1,G} \otimes (\mu_1'^* M_1)) \\
 &\cong \mu_{1!}' (\sigma^* \mathcal{N}'_{1,G} \otimes (\sigma^* \mu_1'^* M_1)) \\
 &\cong \mu_{1!}' (\mathcal{N}_{1,G}'^{-1} \boxtimes M_1) \cong \overline{\mathcal{N}'_1}^{-1} * M_1,
 \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. Finally, let $\mathcal{N}_1 = \mathcal{N}'_1^{-1}$. It is a multiplicative local system on A_1 that satisfies $\overline{\mathcal{N}_1} * M_1 \neq 0$ by construction. It remains to check that $\mathcal{N}_1|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$. However, writing $\mu'' : A \times A_1 \rightarrow A_1$ for the multiplication morphism as before, we see that, on the one hand, $\mu''^*(\overline{\mathcal{N}} * \mathcal{N}_1) \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes \mathcal{N}_1$ by an argument we used to show that $\mu'^* M_1 \cong \mathcal{N} \boxtimes M_1$. On the other hand, $\mu''^*(\overline{\mathcal{N}} * \mathcal{N}_1) \cong (\mathcal{N}_1|_A) \boxtimes \mathcal{N}_1$ by the multiplicativity of $\mathcal{N}_1$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{N}} * \mathcal{N}_1 \neq 0$ (because $\overline{\mathcal{N}} * \overline{\mathcal{N}_1} * M \cong \overline{\mathcal{N}_1} * M_1 \neq 0$), we see that $\mathcal{N}_1|_A \cong \mathcal{N}$, completing the proof of Proposition 5.4.

¹⁵We will eventually prove that $\mathcal{N}_1 = \mathcal{N}'_1^{-1}$ satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 5.4.

A.2. Proof of Lemma A.1. With the notation of the lemma, choose an arbitrary $\mathcal{N}_1 \in A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^*(k)$, and let $\mathcal{N}_{1,X}$ be the pullback of $\mathcal{N}_1$ by the first projection $A_1 \times X \rightarrow A_1$. It is easy to see that the functor $N \mapsto \mathcal{N}_{1,X} \otimes N$ defines an equivalence between the full subcategory $\mathcal{D}_A(A_1 \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A_1 \times X)$ consisting of objects that are equivariant under the action of A on $A_1 \times X$ given by $a \cdot (a_1, g) = (aa_1, g)$ and the subcategory $\mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A_1 \times X)$ defined in the statement of the lemma.

Let $B = A_1/A$. Since $[A_1, A_1] \subset A \subset A_1$ by assumption, we see that B is a connected commutative unipotent group over k . Moreover, writing $\pi : A_1 \rightarrow B$ for the quotient morphism, we see that the pullback functor $(\pi \times \text{id}_X)^*$ yields an equivalence between $\mathcal{D}(B \times X)$ and $\mathcal{D}_A(A_1 \times X)$.

The argument at the end of the proof of Proposition 5.4 (see §A.1) shows that for any $N \in \mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X)$, the Fourier-Deligne transform $\mathcal{F}_X(N)$ is supported on $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^* \times X$. Moreover, it is clear that the map $i : \mathcal{K} \mapsto \mathcal{N}_1^{-1} \otimes \pi^* \mathcal{K}$ induces an isomorphism between B^* and $A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^*$. Finally, let us consider the composition

$$\mathcal{D}(B \times X) \xrightarrow{(\pi \times \text{id}_X)^*} \mathcal{D}_A(A_1 \times X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{1,X} \otimes -} \mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}_X} \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X) \xrightarrow{(i \times \text{id}_X)^*} \mathcal{D}(B^* \times X).$$

It is easy to calculate that this composition is isomorphic to the Fourier-Deligne transform for the commutative group B , which is an equivalence of categories (cf. §3.5). Since the first two functors in the sequence above are equivalences, while the last functor induces an equivalence between $\mathcal{D}(A_{1,\mathcal{N}}^* \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X)$ and $\mathcal{D}(B^* \times X)$, the statement of the lemma follows.

A.3. Consequences of the proof. The arguments presented above easily imply several other useful statements, which will be used in the proof of Proposition 6.7.

The first one follows immediately from property §3.5(2) of the Fourier-Deligne transform in the commutative setting, combined with the argument given in the last paragraph of §A.2.

Corollary A.4 (of the proof of Lemma A.1). *In the situation of Lemma A.1, let the functors*

$$\mathcal{F}_X, \mathcal{F}_{X,*} : \mathcal{D}(A_1 \times X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X)$$

be defined as in §3.4. For every $M \in \mathcal{D}_{A,\mathcal{N}}(A_1 \times X)$, the canonical morphism

$$\mathcal{F}_X M \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{X,*} M$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(A_1^ \times X)$.*

We now claim that a suitable analogue of (a part of) Theorem 4.2 is valid in the noncommutative setting as well. Indeed, let us continue with the notation of Lemma A.1, and suppose now that a regular left action of A_1 on X is given. The subcategory $\mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A_1^* \times X) \subset \mathcal{D}(A_1^* \times X)$ of quasi-equivariant complexes can be defined in exactly the same way as in §4.3.

Proposition A.5. *Let $\Pi : A_1^* \times X \longrightarrow X$ denote the second projection. For every object $N \in \mathcal{D}_{q.e.}(A_1^* \times X)$, the natural morphism $\Pi_! N \longrightarrow \Pi_* N$ is an isomorphism.*

This result is proved by adapting the proof of Theorem 4.2(c) to the present setting, step-by-step, replacing references to properties (1) and (2) stated in §3.5 by references to Lemma A.1 and Corollary A.4, respectively.

A.4. Proof of Proposition 6.7. We end the article by explaining how Proposition 6.7 can be reduced to Proposition A.5. From now on our notation will be as in the statement of Proposition 6.7. The construction of the induction functors

$$\mathrm{ind}_{G''}^G, \mathrm{Ind}_{G''}^G : \mathcal{D}_{G''}(G'') \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G(G)$$

was presented in §1.9; let us make it more explicit.

We will write $\mathrm{conj} : G \times G \longrightarrow G$ for the conjugation action of G on itself, given by $(g_1, g_2) \mapsto g_1 g_2 g_1^{-1}$, and $\mathrm{proj} : G \times G'' \longrightarrow G''$ for the second projection. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G \times G & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{conj}} & G \\ & \searrow q & \nearrow \mathrm{pr}_2 \\ & (G/G'') \times G & \end{array}$$

where pr_2 is the second projection and q is defined by $q(g_1, g_2) = (g_1 G'', g_1 g_2 g_1^{-1})$.

We let G act on $(G/G'') \times G$ diagonally, where the action on the first factor is by left translations, while the action on the second factor is by conjugation, and we denote the corresponding equivariant derived category by $\mathcal{D}_G((G/G'') \times G)$. Note that pr_2 is G -equivariant, where G also acts on itself by conjugation.

Now let $M \in \mathcal{D}_{G''}(G'')$. Then $\mathrm{proj}^* M$ is $(G \times G'')$ -equivariant, where G acts on $G \times G''$ by left multiplication, while G'' acts on $G \times G''$ via $\gamma \cdot (g, g'') = (g\gamma^{-1}, \gamma g'' \gamma^{-1})$. Hence there is a unique (up to natural isomorphism) object $\widetilde{M} \in \mathcal{D}_G((G/G'') \times G)$ such that $q^* \widetilde{M} \cong \mathrm{proj}^* M$. Then $\mathrm{ind}_{G''}^G M = \mathrm{pr}_{2,!} \widetilde{M}$ and $\mathrm{Ind}_{G''}^G M = \mathrm{pr}_{2,*} \widetilde{M}$.

Recall that G'' was defined as the normalizer of $[\mathcal{K}] \in B^*(k)$ in G . Hence the orbit map for the action of G on B^* induces an inclusion $i : G/G'' \hookrightarrow B^*$. In fact, i is a closed embedding, because G is a unipotent group and B^* is affine. Moreover, with the notation introduced above, it is straightforward to verify the following

Claim. If $M \in \mathcal{D}_{B, \mathcal{K}, G''}(G'')$, the complex $(i \times \mathrm{id}_G)_! \widetilde{M} = (i \times \mathrm{id}_G)_* \widetilde{M} \in \mathcal{D}(B^* \times G)$ is quasi-equivariant, where B acts on G by left multiplication.

Combining this claim with Proposition A.5 and the fact that i is a closed embedding, we deduce that for any $M \in \mathcal{D}_{B, \mathcal{K}, G''}(G'')$, the natural morphism $\mathrm{pr}_{2,!} \widetilde{M} \longrightarrow \mathrm{pr}_{2,*} \widetilde{M}$ is an isomorphism, which proves Proposition 6.7.

REFERENCES

- [Ad73] J.F. Adams, *Idempotent functors in homotopy theory*, in: “Manifolds—Tokyo 1973 (Proc. Internat. Conf., Tokyo, 1973),” pp. 247–253. Univ. Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1975.
- [Be80] L. Begueri, *Dualité sur un corps local à corps résiduel algébriquement clos*, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.) 1980/81, no. 4.
- [BBD82] A.A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux Pervers*, in: “Analyse et topologie sur les espaces singuliers (I),” Astérisque **100**, 1982.
- [BL94] J. Bernstein and V. Lunts, “Equivariant sheaves and functors”, Lecture Notes in Math. **1578**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [Bo07] M. Boyarchenko, *Characters of unipotent groups over finite fields*, Preprint, December 2007, [arXiv:0712.2614](https://arxiv.org/abs/0712.2614)
- [BD06] M. Boyarchenko and V. Drinfeld, *A motivated introduction to character sheaves and the orbit method for unipotent groups in positive characteristic*, Preprint, September 2006, [arXiv:math.RT/0609769](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.RT/0609769)
- [BD08] M. Boyarchenko and V. Drinfeld, *Character sheaves on unipotent groups in characteristic $p > 0$* , a talk at the conference “Current Developments and Directions in the Langlands Program”, Northwestern University, May 14, 2008. The slides are available online (in PDF format) at the following URL: <http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~mitya/LanglandsConf.pdf>
- [BoDr] M. Boyarchenko and V. Drinfeld, *Idempotents in monoidal categories*, in preparation, preliminary version available at <http://www.math.uchicago.edu/~mitya/idempotents.pdf>
- [DFH74] A. Deleanu, A. Frei and P. Hilton, *Generalized Adams completion*, Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle **15** (1974), 61–82.
- [DFH75] A. Deleanu, A. Frei and P. Hilton, *Idempotent triples and completion*, Math. Z. **143** (1975), 91–104.
- [De76] P. Deligne, Letter to D. Kazhdan, November 29, 1976 (unpublished).
- [De80] P. Deligne, *La conjecture de Weil II*, Publ. Math. IHES **52** (1980), 137–252.
- [Desh] T. Deshpande, article in preparation.
- [Gr65] M.J. Greenberg, *Perfect closures of rings and schemes*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965), 313–317.
- [KS06] M. Kashiwara and P. Schapira, “Categories and Sheaves”, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. **332**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [LO06] Y. Laszlo and M. Olsson, *The six operations for sheaves on Artin stacks II: Adic coefficients*, Preprint, March 2006, [arXiv:math.AG/0603680](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0603680)
- [Lu03] G. Lusztig, *Character sheaves and generalizations*, in: “The unity of mathematics” (editors: P. Etingof, V. Retakh, I. M. Singer), 443–455, Progress in Math. **244**, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2006, [arXiv:math.RT/0309134](https://arxiv.org/abs/math.RT/0309134)
- [Sa96] M. Saibi, *Transformation de Fourier-Deligne sur les groupes unipotents*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **46** (1996), no. 5, 1205–1242.
- [Se60] J.-P. Serre, *Groupes proalgébriques*, Publ. Math. IHES **7** (1960).
- [SGA4 $\frac{1}{2}$] P. Deligne, with J.-F. Boutot, L. Illusie and J.-L. Verdier, “SGA 4 $\frac{1}{2}$: Cohomologie Étale”, Lecture Notes in Math. **569**, Springer, Heidelberg, 1977.